
9 999999 034498

VOICES OF INDIAN FREEDOM MOVEMENT

VOICES OF INDIAN FREEDOM MOVEMENT

(VOICE OF MUSLIM ISOLATIONISM AND COMMUNALISM)

VOLUME X

Part Four

(Book 1)

Edited and Annotated by

J.C. JOHARI

M.A., LL.B., Ph.D.

AKASHDEEP PUBLISHING HOUSE

New Delhi (India)

1993

AKASHDEEP PUBLISHING HOUSE
4374/4B, Ansari Road
Daryaganj, New Delhi-110 002

PRINTED IN INDIA

Published by Akashdeep Publishing House, New Delhi-110002
and Printed at J.R. Printers, Delhi.

PREFACE

The history of India's freedom movement is a brilliant account of the rise and growth of secular nationalism. But the trends of communalism of various hues also flowed side by side. The Muslim communalism has a place of its own in such a study that witnessed its rise and growth culminating in the unfortunate partition of the country in 1947. A number of distinguished Muslim scholars, leaders and intellectuals played their part in this direction and while some of them subordinated their communal attachments and loyalties to the over-all cause of the nation, others did otherwise and thereby became the architects of a triumphant communalism what they proudly called Muslim nationalism. For this reason, while the former are described as 'nationalist Muslims', the latter are included in the category of 'Muslim nationalists', some of whom became patently anti-nationalist by suggesting the idea of carving out a separate and sovereign state of their co-religionists and also fighting for its achievement.

A proper study of the subject of India's freedom movement covers all what prominent Indian figures thought and did for the great cause ; it also covers important reactions and pronouncements of the British leaders and 'observers'. As such, I have put the matter in two parts. While Part I contains the ideas and utterances of the great Muslim leaders, Part II has some important readings representing the British point of view in appreciation of the Muslim claims. The noteworthy point is that our national leaders spoke in different 'voices' and so I have sought to include their views in different volumes with a view to maintain, as far as possible, the unity of a particular trend. In this volume I have covered the ideas and utterances of some very eminent Muslim figures who played their part in the freedom movement while aligning

themselves with the cause of their own community. It is for this reason that while some remained 'nationalist' through and through, others became 'Muslim first and nationalist after', and more than that, some of them shifted their stands and ultimately got a place of their own in the galaxy of the architects of a separate and sovereign 'homeland' of the Muslims.

I hope that my scheme would receive the appreciation of my readers who would find here much for the purpose of their advanced study or research in this important field of modern Indian history and politics. I have drawn material from numerous sources, Indian and foreign, according to my scheme and I offer my sincere gratitude to all of them. I am thankful to a large number of my friends for the help they extended to me in the completion of this project. In particular, I am grateful to my publishers who appreciated this project and took pains to bring out the volumes in a record time.

—**J.C. Johari**

INTRODUCTION

The role of great Muslim leaders in the freedom movement of our country has its own significance. However, the noticeable point is that while some of them played the role of 'first a nationalist and then a Muslim', some others played the role of 'first a Muslim and then a nationalist' and unfortunately some of them went to the last extent of shifting their stand from that of a true nationalist to that of a rank anti-nationalist by developing their communalism into a nationalism of their own projection. Such a stand was appreciated and, therefore, patronised by the British rulers for the reason of being fully consistent with the vigorous implementation of their policy of 'divide and rule'.[1] It is for this reason that while some enlightened Muslim figures joined the national mainstream with a firm and sincere conviction, others joined it with a view to have their own axe to grind as their minds were filled with a sense of dogmatic attachment to their sectarian interests. A section of Muslim leaders belonging to the latter category sacrificed their true nationalism at the altar of communalism and ultimately became the heroes of the triumphant 'Muslim nationalism'. Allied with it is another noticeable fact that while most of them thought in terms of self-rule within the British Empire implying emancipation of

1. As Jawaharlal Nehru says : "None the less many prominent Moslems joined the National Congress. British policy became definitely pro-Moslem, or rather in favour of those elements among the Moslems who were opposed to the national movement. But early in the twentieth century the tendency towards nationalism and political activity became more noticeable among the younger generation of Moslems. To divert this and provide a safe channel for it, the Moslem League was started in 1906 under the inspiration of the British Government and the leadership of one of its chief supporters, the Agha Khan. The League had two principal objects : loyalty to the British Government and the safeguarding of Moslem interests." *The Discovery of India*, p. 366.

their community within the overall emancipation of the country from foreign rule, others went to the last extent of converting their struggle for an Ulster into a sovereign 'homeland' of their coreligionists.

Not the 'nationalist Muslims' but 'Muslim nationalists' contributed to the estrangement of the Muslims from the national mainstream by sharpening the trend of separatism. The Agha Khan, who advanced the thesis of ethnic reshapening of the Indian provinces,[2] led a delegation of eminent Muslims to wait on Viceroy Lord Minto at Simla on 1 October, 1906 and got the desired reward of separate electorate system for the Muslims under the Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909. Although the M.A.O. College of Aligarh had preached the gospel of Muslim exclusivism and isolationism from the national mainstream,[3] the inspiration of official patronage played its part in the formation of the Moslem League "to provide a political platform for Moslems and thus keep them away from the Congress."[4] The Agha Khan preached the gospel of distinct nationality of the Muslims and their loyalty to the British Raj that was faithfully reiterated by the two Nawabs (Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Viqar-ul-Mulk), Syed Ameer Ali, Ali Imam and others. For instance, in his presidential address delivered at the thirteenth Mohammedan Educational Conference held at Calcutta in 1899, Syed Ameer Ali said: "You are well aware that the land of Hindustan is inhabited by different nations following different religions."

The role of the Ali Brothers may be identified with the role of shrewd leaders who joined the national mainstream with a certain motive. In the heart of their hearts, they were

2. The Agha Khan : *India in Transition*, pp. 44-45.

3. The sectarian nature of the M.A.O College becomes evident from one of its objects saying that "it shall be primarily the education of the Mohammedans and so far as may be consistent therewith, of the Hindus and other persons." *Selected Documents of the Aligarh Archives*, edited by Yusuf Husain, Bombay, Asia Pub. House, 1967, p. 315.

4. Nehru, *op. cit*, p. 375.

Muslims first and nationalists after. Not the cause of the motherland but the cause of the Khilafat forced them to be with the Indian National Congress and to appreciate the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. And so when they found that the movement had failed miserably, they showed their true colour. The elder one (Shaukat Ali) was quick tempered, of course, and uncompromising on issues which he took as contrary to his convictions. Hence, the line taken by the Congress in doing away with the system of separate electorates for the Muslims and their replacement by the system of joint electorates, including some provision in a similar form to the non-Muslim people of the Muslim-majority provinces of the Punjab and Bengal (as suggested in the Nehru Report of 1928) came as a bitter and indigestible pill to him. The result was that Shaukat Ali, who was once identified with the Congress, had to break with it on the issue of the position of the Muslims in future independent India. The Nehru Report "sealed the differences."[5] And yet it should be affirmed that even after leaving the Congress and saying many bad things about its ideology and leadership, he did not endorse the idea of a separate Muslim state. Hence, it may be pointed out that notwithstanding his open opposition to the Congress, he "remained throughout his life an honourable opponent. He never tried to stab his enemies in the back."[6]

So is the case with the younger (Mohammed) Ali. By his character he was a person who could compromise with no one on issues which he regarded as contrary to his religious and political convictions. On one occasion, he said : "Where God commands I am a Muslim first, a Muslim second, and a Muslim last, and nothing but a Muslim. My first duty is to my Maker, not to His Majesty, the King. But where India's freedom is concerned, where the welfare of India is concerned, I am an Indian first, an Indian second, and an Indian last, and

---

5. S.P. Sen (ed.) : *Dictionary of National Biography*, Institute of Historical Studies, Calcutta, 1974, Vol. IV, p. 178.

6. *Ibid.*

nothing but an Indian."[7] The result was that the political and economic vicissitudes of the late 1920s drew him away from the Indian National Congress of what he was once the President and was even regarded as its individual part. Like his elder brother he sought to use the national organisation of India as an instrument for a particular purpose and when he felt disillusioned, he became its sworn critic. Once a strong defender of the partition of Bengal, he left the scene with a desire for the emancipation of his coreligionists within the framework of the emancipation of the country. So it is observed : "Mohammed Ali, who was once the uncrowned king of the national forces of Muslim India, was a lone soul in his last days, politically heart-broken and physically diabetic. His indefatiguable spirit, however, kept on goading him to reach the goal."[8]

In Muhammed Shafi we find the case of a communalist having nothing to do with nationalism even in a superficial form as we may trace in the role of the Ali Brothers. Like the Agha Khan, he regarded India as an integral part of the British Empire and the Empire as a common heritage of the Indians and the English. His role in awakening the political consciousness of the Muslims was in fitting continuation of the endeavours of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. As a leader of the Muslim League, he nourished his coreligionists with educational opportunity and administrative positions and sought to organise them politically. Like the two Nawabs, he struggled for safeguarding the interests of his community until the evolution of a common Indian nationality. Thus, on the national plane, he "could hardly rise above communal politics and loyal cooperation to the British Raj."[9]

Basically a poet and a philosopher and then a lawyer and a politician, Mohammed Iqbal occupies a place of distinction

---

7. Shan Muhammed (ed.) : *Unpublished Letters of Ali Brothers*, p. xxi.

8. S.P. Sen, *op cit.*, Vol. III, p. 150.

9 *Ibid*, Vol. IV, p. 140.

in the galaxy of the distinguished intellectuals of our country. But for our purpose, he presents the strange case of being first a nationalist, then a communalist and, lastly, an anti-nationalist mooting the idea of a separate state of the Muslims.[10] He argued that "the life of Islam as a cultural force in this country very largely depends upon its centralisation in a specific territory."[11] He reiterated the same view in his later addresses as a member of the delegation of the Muslim League for the Round Table Conferences held in London in 1931 and 1932. On 21 March, 1932 he presided over the meeting of the All-India Muslim League held at Lahore when he said : "The whole community needs a complete overhauling of its mentality in order that it may again become capable of feeling the urge for fresh desires and ideals ... Concentrate your whole ego on yourself alone and ripen your clay into real manhood if you wish to see your aspirations realised."[12] In a confidential letter addressed to Jinnah (dated 10 November, 1937) he confidently asserted : "To my mind the new constitution (Act of 1935) with its idea of a single Indian federation of the Muslim provinces is the only course by which we can secure a peaceful India and save the Muslims from the domination of the non-Muslims. Why should not the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal be considered as nations entitled to self-determination just as other nations in India and outside India are."[13] In his letters to Jinnah he also stressed the point of India's partition for this purpose. For all this, he "deserves the credit for

10. In his presidential address delivered at the annual session held at Allahabad in 1930 he in very clear terms said : "I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. Self-government within the British Empire, or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim state appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims at least of North-West India," See Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada : *Foundations of Pakistan*, Vol II, pp. 153-71.

11. *Ibid*

12. Asif Iqbal Khan : *Some Aspects of Iqbal's Thought*, p. 75-76.

13. See Hector Bolitho : *Jinnah* : *Creator of Pakistan*, p. 114.

"visualising a Muslim state with a clear notion of an ideology it must adhere to. Though primarily a poet and a philosopher, we also owe to him first and formal enunciation of two-nation theory."[14]

Iqbal saw a dream and his instrument (Jinnah) realised it. Hence, while the latter got the distinction of being the 'father' of Pakistan, the former deserves the credit of being its 'intellectual father'. Jinnah publicly acknowledged Iqbal as his 'friend, philosopher and guide'. It is nothing but an irony of history that Jinnah once lauded as 'an ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity' "later unhappily associated himself with the most reactionary elements in Muslim communalism."[15] It is an indisputable fact that after the defeat of the Muslim League in the elections of 1937, he became "a diehard communalist and his politics assumed the character of aggressiveness."[16] In the case of both, the common point is that they started their political career as nationalist Muslims, but they shifted their stand first to become Muslim nationalists and then, from the viewpoint of Indian nationalists, rank anti-nationalists by converting the gospel of Muslim isolationism and communalism into, what the historians of Pakistan proudly declare, triumphant Muslim nationalism. In this respect the two great leaders occupy a place quite different from all prominent Muslim figures who played their part in India's freedom movement some of whom have been covered in this volume.

—**J.C. Johari**

14. Asif Iqbal Khan, *op. cit.*, p. 91.
15. Jawaharlal Nehru : *An Autobiography*, p. 68.
16. Lal Bahadur : *Struggle for Pakistan*, p. 281.

CONTENTS

PART I

NATIONALIST MUSLIMS AND MUSLIM NATIONALISTS

I must send Your Excellency a line to say that a very big thing has happened today.[1] A work of statesmanship that will affect India and Indian history for many a long years. It is nothing less than the pulling back of sixty-two millions of people from joining the ranks of a seditious opposition.

—**Lady Mary Minto**[2]

---

1. It refers to the secret Simla conference when a delegation of the eminent Muslims led by the Agha Khan had waited on the Viceroy (Lord Minto) on 1 October, 1906.

2. Lady Minto : *India under Morley and Minto, 1905-1910* (London : Macmillan 1914), pp. 47-48.

1

THE AGHA KHAN

[Universally known as the Agha Khan III by virtue of being the grandson of Agha Hasan Ali Shah and also known as the Agha Khan I, Sultan Muhammed Shah (1877-1957) claimed direct descent from Prophet Muhammed through his daughter Fatima and her husband Ali. He played a notable part in the freedom movement of India without confining himself to the narrow outlook of nationalism. He sought to interlink nationalism with growing internationalism that broadened his sphere of activity and earned for him the name of a peerless Asiatic personality. He was appointed as a member of the Imperial Legislative Council by Viceroy Lord Curzon in 1902 and in the same year he presided over the Muhammedan Education Conference held at Delhi. However, the memorable event took place in October, 1906 when he led a delegation of 35 eminent Muslims to meet Viceroy Lord Minto at Simla with a long memorandum. The secret parleys of the Simla Conclave yielded dividends. About two months after, a separate political organisation of the Muslims (Muslim League) came into being and the demand for separate electorates for the Muslims saw its fulfilment in the provisions of the Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909. Like Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, he insisted that Muslims must work to bring about political awakening among them. He advocated the case of constitutional reforms so as to safeguard the interests of the Muslims. But he did not desire India's break from the Empire as the continuation of the British rule was in the best interests of the Indian Muslims. He did not espouse the cause of political pan-Islamism though he lent some support to the demand for protecting the Turkish empire. On

account of being a man of moderate views, he desired some kind of compromise between different groups of the Muslim League over the provisions of the Nehru Report (1928). But a ter the lapsing of the Nehru constitution, he frankly advocated the gospel of Muslim isolationism and separatism. It is evident from his utterances at the Round Table Conference held at London in 1930. In this way, he could carve out a place for himself in the list of the architects of a separate state of the Muslims. Thus, Theodore Morison could visualise during the early years of the present century : 'I am hopeful that during the next half century the Agha Khan will play that part in directing the destinies of the world of Islam for which his position and abilities so eminently qualify him.'']

CONSTITUTIONALISM AND RESPONSIBLE* GOVERNMENT

THE REASONS FOR FREEDOM

Soon after undertaking the preparation of this book I was set thinking by a conversation with one of the most distinguished of present-day British publicists, the greatest living authority on Russia and Central and Fastern Europe. His keen intimacy with world politics embraces mankind from China to Peru, but alas ! in the course of his long and busy life he has never had occasion to visit India or specially study her affairs. He asked me why India required any marked change of system. Taking into consideration the divisions of the people, the illiteracy of the masses, the rivalries of religions and races, he asked why, confronted by all this clash and backwardness, England could not go on more or less as she had done throughout the nineteenth century, and rule her vast Asiatic dominions with undivided but conscientiously exercised authority.

My friend maintained that divisions being deep and real and political harmony being confined to a small minority of the upper and educated classes, there will be no real need for a

*From H.H. The Agha Khan : *India in Traniition : A Study in Political Revolution*, 1918, Chapters 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 16, 17, 24.

change of policy until such time the masses insist on their rights and take a share in the responsibilities of government. His purpose was, I think, to draw from me a reasoned statement of the case for reform. Coming from the incisive critic alike of the reign and policy of Alexander III and of the ultra-democratic Bolshevists of the hour this view seemed to me singularly unconvincing. If there is one thing which modern history proves, it is this : that unless the government and the governing classes take up the task of raising the masses of the people gradually, but surely, thus founding the fabric of the commonwealth on the widest and deepest basis possible, namely, the whole population, the State renders itself liable to years and years of anarchy and disaster, and perhaps to dissolution.

Look at the Russian portent. Had Alexander II lived a few years longer, had the policy of Loris Milikoff been carried out in 1881, had the last twenty years of the nineteenth century been occupied with construction and education, with uniting the people and the government, and with the evolution of self-government in the various provinces, how different and how happy and healthy Russian history would have been ! Taking another instance, the disastrous reign of Abdul Hamid in Turkey might have been one of revivifying forces, had that astute but misguided sovereign devoted the same period to the work of gradual association of the people with the government on the one hand, and to social and cultural development of the masses on the other. In China, had the late Empress-Dowager initiated her death-bed scheme of gradual reform twenty-five years sooner, would that countless and intelligent nation have been to-day a danger to herself and her neighbours, and a real source of weakness to humanity at large ?

Conversely there are examples of countries where advise and patriotic aristocracy, in association with an intelligent monarchy belonging to the soil, bas worked wonders and has so interwoven the interests of every class that even the Socialists are to-day the pillars of the State. Japan is a case in

point, and Prussia, whatever its severity and remorselessness towards outside peoples, provides an instance of successful consolidation of all classes through gradual steps of greater association of the people with the government. England herself supplies the outstanding clear-cut example of this healthy development, though she differs from the two other instances quoted by her work having been almost unconscious. Instead of taking place in two centuries, as in Prussia, and in two generations, as in Japan, it has gone on from the dawn of English history.

If the British, on whom historical causes have thrown the ultimate responsibility for the future of India and of surrounding states and nations, were to fail in this their greatest task, Southern Asia would become the theatre of one of the heaviest disasters humanity has faced. Sooner or later, an ignorant and innumerable proletariat, extending over nearly the whole length of Asia from the Red Sea to the Pacific, divided by religion and race and language, would be faced with the problem of self-government and self-development. The course of Russian history in our times provides a tragic warning to those who are responsible for the future of India of the dangers of leaving the apparently well alone, and of not working for the development of the masses in rights and duties alike and in responsibility towards society. It has been well said that the British tenure in India must be one of continuous amelioration.

But apart from these lessons of modern history we have to recognise the existence of internal forces in India proper and in the neighbouring state and principalities that render a policy of standing still or of merely nominal concession a practical impossibility since it would work disaster, in the long run, alike for Britain and for India. These forces may not individually be powerful enough to compel renunciation of existing forms of government; but, taken together and in connection with other world forces which react even in remote portions of Southern Asia, they are so enormous in their effect that a radical change of outlook is necessary. A brief examination of some of the more important of them is desirable.

In the forefront we must place the fact that until the summer of 1914 there was a white and European solidarity *vis-a-vis* Asia and Africa which, though officially unrecognized, was yet the foundation of European policy in the widest sense of the term. A small but suggestive point of nomenclature illustrates my meaning. The British governing classes and the white mercantile community were referred to throughout India as "Europeans," and the general line of differentiation as between the governors and the governed was shown by the terms "European" and "Native," or latterly the more acceptable cognomen "Indian." There were many other signs of the concert of Europe at work, though of course officially unrecognised. The German, French or Italian trader or missionary had social union with the British rulers and business men, carrying inherent privileges that made them members of the same governing European family. But the Great War has broken up that solidarity. The German and Austrian missionary and trader has been interned in India or repatriated, and all and sundry have watched the humiliation of these fallen members of the white race. The most remote villagers have heard of the sepoys who have fought hand to hand with the fairest inhabitants of Europe. The long-maintained racial line of demarcation has been largely replaced by that of allegiance to Sovereign and flag.

For the full establishment of this sound guiding principle the claims of merit and fidelity must become predominant. By universal testimony this war has shown that the loyalty of the people of India to Emperor and Empire is second to none. In no other belligerent country, not even in Great Britain or Germany, have the forces of sedition and anarchy been so minute in proportion to the numbers of the law-abiding as in India. The small and insignificant factions which sought to create difficulties at a time of Imperial stress were but as a drop in the ocean, and all classes came forward to help England in her hour of trial. True the numbers of recruits, though vastly in excess of normal requirements, were small compared to the teeming population. But, as will be seen when we discuss the military needs of India, this was due to obvious

historical, sociological, and political causes, not to any want of loyalty. Wherever and whenever any help could be given by the people of India, it was heartily bestowed. Can the annals of any other country ruled by an essentially foreign governing class responsible to an external Power, show the people coming forward and making equal sacrifices from patriotic motives ?

The explanation of this now historic fact, so puzzling and disappointing to Teutonic enemies of England, is simple. Though to foreigners and onlookers India may be a conquered country, yet British rule was extended (with Indian help) so insidiously and so gradually, it has lasted so long and the work of conquest and administration has from the first been carried on by British heads and Indian hands to such an extent, that the average Indian does not look upon himself as belonging to a conquered people, or on his country as dominated by foreigners. He has awakened to the reality only when he has tried to visit the British self-governing Dominions, which have now agreed to a more liberal-minded policy. This altogether healthy Indian sentiment cannot last unless changes are introduced in the administration so as to give the people a fuller share and voice in the control of affairs in their own country. Many forces, internal and external, are working to awaken Indians in general, and the urban population in particular, to the reasonableness of their claims to a share in their own government.

And if we turn to neighbouring countries within the orbit of India we find that some have enjoyed to the present time forms of self-government, and others look upon themselves as conquering and independent races. Take the case of Mesopotamia. However bad Turkish rule there may have been yet, even under Abdul Hamid's absolutist government, there was nominal equality of rights between Turk and Arab. Under the Young Turks, however insubstantial constitutional government may have been, the people of Baghdad and of Basra had the same rights of representation in the Chamber of Deputies as the people of Ismid or Adrianople, though in practice they were reduced to nothing of substantial value.

Yet if Mesopotamia is to become a British or a semi-British province, it is impossible to establish a purely bureaucratic administration among a people who have had at least nominal equality of opportunity with the Turkish rulers. Can it be seriously maintained that Britain can establish a government based in some degree on co-operation of the rulers and the ruled in Mesopotamia, and at the same time continue in India an administration in no sense responsible to the people ? Though illiteracy is alas ! still general, though divisions, especially amongst the untaught masses, are deep, there is a general consensus of opinion amongst the upper and middle classes that the establishment of an administrative system more or less responsible to the people, and drawing its forces from their confidence and co-operation, cannot be long delayed.

We all know that the vast Indian majority consists of illiterate peasants and field labourers in the rural districts, but it must not be forgotten that the urban dwellers and the literate classes, though forming but a small proportion of the aggregate total, are still numerous enough to be equal to the population of a secondary European state. In 1911 the urban ratio was 9.5 per cent, and the census recorded more than 18½ million literates. Each year the schools and colleges and factories draw more and more from the great reservoir of the country districts to the towns and cities. No one familiar with modern India will deny that everywhere in the towns and in almost every class, there is a growing desire for a form of government that will allow the Indian to carry his head high as a citizen of a free Empire, and at the same time will provide the means for raising the lower classes of the rural population to a fuller standard of citizenship and life.

Again, a fundamental change has come over the Indian outlook on public affairs. I have often been told by English civilians that the Musulmans need another Sir Syed Ahmed, and that it is a pity that his political policy has disappeared. My answer has always been that Lord Beaconsfield and his Mahomedan policy are as dead as cold mutton. I am not sure if the gentlemen who started the conversation on these lines

always realised what this answer conveyed. But here it is necessary to put on record the changed perspective within the last generation.

Twenty-five years ago the average Indian Moslem looked upon himself as a member of a universal religious brotherhood, sojourning in a land in which a neutral Government, with a neutral outlook, kept law and order and justice. His political and communal pride was satisfied by the fact that his co-religionists in Turkey, Persia, Morocco, and (nominally at least) in Egypt enjoyed independence and national sovereignty. While his allegiance was to Queen Victoria, his political self-respect was satisfied by the existence of the Sultans at Constantinople and Fez, and of the Shah and Khedive at Teheran and Cairo. The fact that the British Government was the mainstay and support in the diplomatic arena of the independent Mahomedan States was naturally a source of continued gratification to him. Far be it from me to suggest that all this was actually and consciously thought, and deductions made therefrom. But it is the semi-conscious and the sub-conscious that give atmosphere to national even more than to individual life. It was sub-conscious hostility towards Western Europe that drove Germany into war, and it was sub-conscious sentiment that early in the present century drew the peoples of England and France together, long before they were compelled to draw the sword for the defence of the liberty and civilisation of mankind.

Within this generation, the whole Mahomedan world-outlook has changed. Forces beyond Moslem control led to the disappearance of Mahomedan rule and independence in North Africa. Persia gradually drifted into being merely a name for spheres of influence between Britain and Russia. Turkey herself, the last of the independent Mahomedan dominions, was drawn into the Teutonic orbit, first through economic and semi-political causes, and finally by her participation in the Great War on the German side. I do not suggest that the destruction of the independence of these last Moslem States was conscious and deliberate ; but so strong are the world forces of this

generation that states and societies which have stood still for centuries have now been overthrown by the strong currents of European and American activity. The net result is that the Indian Mahomedan, instead of holding but the outposts of Islam in the East, sees around him nothing but Moslem societies in a far greater state of decay than his own. The banner of the Prophet is no longer in strong hands in North Africa or Persia, and Turkey has become the political enemy of England and a satrapy of Germany. Under these circumstances, he necessarily looks upon India more and more as the hope of his political freedom and as the centre that may still raise the other Mahomedan countries to a higher standard of civilisation.

Another point to be remembered is that while, under the old conditions, the Mahomedans were doomed to be nothing but a one-fifth minority in an overwhelmingly Brahmanical India, to-day, as the forces of disruption gain strength in Western Asia, it is not improbable that the South Asiatic Federation of to-morrow, of which India must be the centre and the pivot, will contain not only the 66½ millions of Indian Moslems, but the thirty or forty millions more Musulmans inhabiting South Persia, Mesopotamia, Arabia, and Afghanistan. If we turn from numbers to surface of territory, the Islamic provinces of South Asia will be almost as great in extent as the India of yesterday. Hence there is little danger of the Mahomedans of India being nothing but a small minority in the coming federation. No doubt these considerations, again, are sub-conscious and semi-conscious ; but they are potent. The Indian Moslem of to-day is no more haunted by the fear of being a powerless minority ; nor has he constantly to look for his sentimental satisfaction to the Islamic States outside India.

Turning our gaze from the Moslems to the vast Hindu population, we find among its educated members the feeling that the great conflict announced as a war for liberty and freedom, for the protection of self-development in small countries, such as Belgium and Serbia, carries for the Allies the implication that political freedom is the heritage of every

nation, great or small. The principles that render the Allied cause just in Europe are of universal application, *mutatis mutandis,* and lead to the deduction that India, too, must be set on the path of self-government. At this moment India and Egypt are almost the only two stable and advanced great countries where the administration is not in any appreciable degree responsible to the people, and where the foundation of State polity is the theory that the government is superior to the governed. Some fifteen years ago, when, for instance, Lord Curzon and Lord Cromer ruled in India and in Egypt, Russia, Turkey, Persia, and China were all ruled on this principle. But recent transformations in those lands leave the position of India unique. China and the Russias are republics, with nominally the most democratic forms of government, and Persia and Turkey both claim to be considered constitutional monarchies. Thus, in India alone we have a Government that is not only in practice free from internal parliamentary control, but is actually based on the principle that final decisions are in the hands of an administration not responsible to the people, although some opportunities for criticism are given in the Viceregal and provincial legislatures. The contradictory position of the Government leads to its being open to attack from all quarters, and yet to its being considered anomalous that Indians, alone of the great Eastern peoples, should have no control over their administration. These causes, and many others, have led to general expectation and desire throughout the length and breadth of India that, when the cause of liberty as represented by the Allied armies has led humanity through victory to peace, the structure of Indian administration also may be brought into line with the spirit of the times and a reasonable share of control and supervision be given to the Indian public.

If we turn to the Native States and to the fully or semi-independent countries, such as Afghanistan and Nepal and the Arabian principalities, we find a general recognition on the part of the authorities that the time is coming for sharing their powers with the ruled. The best administered of the Native

States and most of the princes desire to establish some form of legislative or other constitutional government. This would serve the two-fold purpose of giving their States the prestige and force of national institutions, and the ruling houses the claim of being united with the people by the ties of co-operation in the work of administration. In Afghanistan some attempt, howsoever nominal, has been made by the present King to lay the foundations of a representative institution. In fact everywhere in South Asia we find local forces striving, if sometimes unconsciously, after forms of administration more or less modern in character and leading to association and cooperation between the sovereign power and the nation. It follows that however excellent the present administration of India may be, however efficient and suited to the conditions of the recent past, it is not for the people of England to deny to their great Eastern Empire those forms of constitutionalism which were first developed in Britain and with the manifestations of which, whether in infancy or vigorous growth, England has always sympathised in the case of other countries on the European, American, and Asiatic continents.

Apart from the general considerations examined hitherto, there are administrative reasons which render imperative a change of system and policy. To begin with, no sounder political theory has been laid down than that maintained by the English economists, namely, good finance is the foundation of good government. It was bad finance that broke up the monarchy in Franco, and the most disastrous of present-day examples, Turkey and Russia, point to the same conclusion—that without sound finance ruin overtakes society. In India innumerable Viceroys, Secretaries of State and other competent observers have always held that good finance is fundamental to the moral authority of British rule. If this has been the case in the past, when the work of government was limited, how much more so to-day and to-morrow, when civilised societies expect from their governments the righting of social wrongs, thorough handling of the problems of sanitation and public instruction, and the establishment of a certain level of well-being as the inherent right of every citizen ?

Now, British rule in India has been criticised, and rightly criticised, for having allowed the twentieth century to dawn and grow without having grappled fully and successfully with the illiteracy general in India, and with the insanitary environment of the masses so bad that avoidable deaths are counted by the million every year, while the standard of the physique of the masses is deplorably low. The various modern departments of State that lead towards social betterment and social welfare in the West have still to be organised. The Indian public conscience unanimously demands that British rule should come into line with progressive modern ideas and tackle illiteracy and other social problems left far too long unsolved.

We shall be told, rightly, that at bottom, these are questions of bearable taxation. How are we to provide the means for meeting such crying needs of India ? There are only two ways : either by co-operation between the Government and the governed and by discussion, proving to the representatives of the people the need, and thus making the Indian public itself the judge of the extent of the necessary sacrifice ; or by mere fiat and mandate of the Supreme Government imposing taxation. Lord Cromer always held in conversations which I had with him that a government such as that of Britain in India and Egypt could not maintain itself except by light taxation, and Lord Morley's lately published "Recollections" show him to be of a like opinion. But Lord Cromer's own rule at Cairo laid itself open to the pointed criticism that while the Egyptian peasant grew rich he remained dirty and ignorant, superstitious and slovenly. Does not this go to prove that bureaucratic government, when well-intentioned and paternal, is conscious of some lack of moral right to call for those sacrifices from the people that will raise their condition in the cultural and sociological field *pari passu* with, or in advance of, their economic progress ?

In India, however, it is far too late to adopt Lord Cromer's policy of light taxation in preference to modern advancement. The best rulers of Native States have endeavoured in their relatively small way to solve the problems of illiteracy and

social betterment. The leaders of India unanimously expect from their Government the steady provision of those agencies which in Europe and America have brought about the fusion of culture between the masses and the classes. It is for the Government to take steps necessary to find the means for carrying out this policy, and this can be done with the co-operation of the representatives of the people and by discussion that will prove to the rulers and the ruled that the resources to be tapped are those that can best bear the burden of greater taxation.

If we turn from the problem of finance to the only other equally important and equally essential principle of government, namely, that of defence, we are forced to the same conclusion : that the sharing of responsibility between the people of India and its government is now necessary. I earnestly cherish the hope of President Wilson that a society of nations may result from the tremendous cost and suffering of these years of conflict, and I am convinced that forms of arbitration and limitation of armaments, through international agencies of control, will arise after the war. Yet no one who looks at the problem of Asia to-day can doubt that India must be prepared and ready to defend herself. Whether Britain keeps Mesopotamia, or whether that rich but neglected land becomes an independent principality or republic under British suzerainty, or whether it goes back to some form of Turkish control, yet its economic relations with India must so grow as to give us in practice a trans-Gulf frontier to defend. The same is true of Persia, and if we look Eastwards, with the growth of Japan and with the problem of our North-East frontier touching China, we cannot afford to neglect India's potentialities.

Now, a small and professional army, such as India had and has to-day, can never possess the reserves and the natural expanding power to meet modern war, with its terrible casualties, with its heavy technical services, with its lines of communication to be conserved and defended. While the Russias

will not trouble us for generations, Germany, directly or indirectly, has become an Asiatic Power. Assuming that Turkey loses Mesopotamia and Syria, German military organisation will yet still be supreme on the other side of the Taurus Mountains and in the uplands of Asia Minor. Howsoever friendly modern Japan may be, and howsoever impotent modern China, yet India can never again be left to depend merely on Japanese goodwill and Chinese weakness for her security against attack from the East. Just as Australia, although she has the sea to protect her from sudden attack, has had to organise her defensive forces on modern lines by universal training, so the India of the next decade must develop her internal forces in such a way as to be able to meet any sudden emergency.

In India, with its 315,000,000 inhabitants, universal military service can be hardly feasible and probably will never be necessary ; yet some form of fairly distributed national service falling on, say, 10 per cent of the inhabitants of each locality, to be selected by purely physical tests of healthiness and efficiency, can alone meet her problem of defence. No doubt the military training here referred to will not be the two or three years of the German and French Armies, but rather the six months of the Swiss forces. Such is, in fact, the proposal contained in a Territorial scheme submitted to the Indian Government in 1916. Still, this will be such a tax on the energy and life of the people that it is inconceivable that any country should willingly accept it without the imprimatur of her elected spokesmen ; nor can such representation be merely nominal as at present. It must comprise men drawn directly from the masses and from every locality.

Thus, from the two essential points of view of finance and defence alike, we come to the conclusion that a higher standard of citizenship, with both greater sacrifices and greater responsibilities, must be imposed on the people if the great work of Britain is not to end in failure. The accomplishment of the task which destiny has placed before England cannot be

complete unless India is raised, through social laws and institutions, to the standard of at least a backward European or Spanish-American country. The necessary corollary is that India must be so able to defend herself from foreign aggression as to make her independent of the mere goodwill or the accidental and temporary importance of her neighbours. Yet neither of these two great conditions can be brought about without the co-operation, through representative institutions, of the people with the Government, and without a thorough change of system that unites the administration with the masses by constant discussion leading to unity of aim between the direct representatives of the people and the highest officers of the Crown.

Thus, from several principal points of view and apart from the many minor lines of argument that lead to the same conclusions, we see that the Government of India needs radical change ; that the time has come when it should be no more a mere government of fiat, however excellent the fiat. but an essentially modern State based on the co-operation of every community and of the Government, by giving to the people themselves the right to direct policy. In succeeding chapters I hope to show that this metamorphosis will not only lead to the happiness and contentment of India, but to the strengthening of the British Empire as a whole and to drawing India nearer to Fngland and the Dominions.

A FEDERAL BASIS

The perusal of the last chapter might lead the man in the street to the facile conclusion that the grant of representative assemblies, such as European States possess, would meet the needs of India, and that a full plan of co-operation between rulers and the ruled could be easily brought about by an edict from the King-Emperor. No such short cut to constitutionalism will do in India. To begin with, parliamentary government so far has been markedly successful only in countries of relatively small area, however populous any such

given area may be. England, France, Germany, Sweden, Italy—you find no country with a greater surface than two or three hundred thousand square miles. We can draw no conclusions from the constitutions of Canada, Australia, and some of the South American republics, because these States are still at the dawn of national life ; their populations are but handfuls compared to what they must be when full development is reached. At present society is limited to certain large cities and emporiums of trade, and small, widely scattered rural communities. In the United States, on the other hand, the very name of the country shows that the Republic consists of independent parliamentary communities.

This view of a State, relatively small in area or population, as the best foundation of parliamentary government was held by Bismarck, as I learned from his son, Count Herbert, in Berlin, only two years after the death of the founder of United Germany. In the course of a long conversation about a federation that has been fraught with such momentous consequences to mankind, Herbert Bismarck told me that one of the features which led his father to expect a successful development was that the great majority of administrative affairs would remain in the hands of each of the individual States of the Bundesrat. The Reichstag would deal only with questions relating to the Army, Foreign, and Maritime affairs. Bismarck maintained to the end that organic parliamentary union ; such as exists in France and in the United Kingdom, would break down in Germany since the empire, instead of being a compact geographical unit, was a long and scattered dominion. If, this could be said of Germany, how much truer it is of far wider empires. And since Russia secured some parliamentary freedom, we have seen inevitable causes leading to her break-up into smaller state organisms. Though the present rush of disruptive forces may be the result of war, ignorance, and the long period of misgovernment, can anyone doubt that, at best, liberty and freedom in Russia would have led to her division into component states ?

If, on the other hand, it is maintained that modern science, through vast railways and still more through rapid aerial navigation, has reduced distances, and that probably before the next few years are over aerial travelling will further abridge them, this convention will not remove the condition that only the geographically small parliamentary unit can be free and great. For, as we see, while Science on the one side brings distant places nearer, on the other hand, by giving intensive culture to localities and by highly developing local economic interests, it undoes the results of its first and apparent action. In a large primitive area, while distances are enormous and means of communication few, yet unless great natural obstacles, such as mountains and seas, arise, there is a general similarity of interest and occupation that makes for homogeneity. On the other hand, the higher the development of modern civilisation on a continent, the more heterogeneous and individual its parts become. And if this be true of Europe, with its single type of culture, it is far more applicable to India, where all the four main civilisations of the world are found, and where the problem is still further complicated by relatively minor differences of race, religion, history, and development.

Even in a political entity so small in area as the United Kingdom, independently of the embittered controversies caused by Ireland's racial and religious differences, the legislative combination of England and Wales, Scotland and Ireland has presented serious practical drawbacks. The efficiency of the Mother of Parliaments is notoriously hampered by the excessive pressure of detailed work, and the impossibility of more than a few members possessing the requisite local knowledge in reference to private bills, and the other wants of varying districts. Suggestions for the setting up of local parliaments, not only for Ireland and Scotland, but for Wales and homogeneous portions of England, were being made with increasing acceptance before the energies of the Empire had to be concentrated on the mighty task still in hand. France has had a centralised form of government for centuries and, except

amongst some of the people of Britanny, and the Basque of the Pyrenees, is as united a nation as can be desired. Yet even in France there are thinkers, in the South at all events, who have yearnings for local parliaments. One of the most successfully governed countries of the world, Switzerland, where you find the ideal combination of liberty and order, is ruled by small, freely elected parliaments over cantons of such compact dimensions that each citizen is a real participant in the affairs of his province. This illustration is specially important because Switzerland, on a small scale, like India on a large one, consists of different nationalities grouped by political union.

Whatever may be said of the general merits of the Indian reform scheme outlined in the joint address of a number of prominent Indians and Europeans submitted to the Viceroy and the Secretary of State in November, 1917, there can be no doubt as to the political soundness of its arguments from history against legislative centralisation in so vast an area :—

"The examples of the United States, Canada, Australia and South Africa, as contrasted with India, China and the dependencies of Spain and France in the eighteenth century, prove that under elective institutions provincial administration cannot be made effective for units of population the size of great nations. Had the United States attempted to develop herself on the basis of five or six provinces, each would, for administrative reasons, have been driven to subdivide itself into minor self-governing provinces commensurate in size with the existing forty-eight States Country councils or district boards cannot take the place of provincial governments, which in nations of a certain magnitude, must be interposed between local authorities on the one hand, and the national government on the other. Hence, the Government of the United Kingdom, with its population of 45,000,000, is increasingly unable to cope with their need for social reform."

In a word, for India, with her vast population, her varied provinces and races, her many sectarian differences (brought

to the surface by the present search for the lines of constitutional advance), a unilateral form of free government is impossible. If we include in our survey the far greater grouping of to-morrow, to which we have given the name of the South Asiatic Federation, the idea is still more hopelessly impracticable. It is common knowledge that, even with an administration not responsible to the people and an elaborate bureaucratic system, there have been increasing complaints by the Indian provincial administrations of excessive interference and of being kept in leading strings by the central authority. Masterful Viceroys like Lord Curzon have sought to keep all the threads of administration in their own hands; but when their tenure has expired the provincial officials have renewed their efforts to modify and lessen the control of Simla. Diversified as have been the reform proposals submitted to Mr. Montagu during his Indian tour, there has been an extraordinary consensus of opinion that the growth in recent years of the activities of Government render imperative the devolution of some of the powers exercised by the central authority.

An outstanding difficulty in providing a central parliament for India is that the vast majority of the inhabitants are alike illiterate and in such deep poverty as to render impracticable their enfranchisement as electors of an Imperial assembly. Still, this argument should not be used by reactionaries, bureaucrats, and Anglo-Indians generally against the Indian educated classes in their plea for constitutional reform. It must not be forgotten that since the earliest years of the present century Indian leaders, under the inspiration of that lamented patriot G.K. Gokhale, have advocated universal and compulsory free education, in full recognition that its cost will have to be borne in some form or another by the taxpayers of the country. The claim for at least a beginning in this direction has been made by the National Congress since 1904. For reasons of a practical kind, which do not seem to me to have been adequate and which are steadily losing their force, officialdom did not see its way to make such a beginning

even on a local option basis, until last year, when the Bombay Government supported the Bill of a non-official member which duly passed into law, for giving municipalities power to compel school attendance. It cannot be said that theories of the freedom of the individual and Spencerian ideas of limitation of State activity stood in the way. For, after all, the officials with whom the last word rested have been reared in a country where universal compulsory education has been established for more than forty-five years. The experiment has been tried with substantial success in some of the Native States, under wise and patriotic princes like the rulers of Baroda, Bikaner, Mysore, Kapurthala, Cochin, and Bhavanagar. I do not deny the existence of practical difficulties in the application of the principle under the diversified conditions obtaining in the vast territories of British India ; but with patient determination these can be steadily surmounted, and it seems to me that there is no strong reason for not giving general local option to confer this great boon on the people, other than the natural reluctance of an overwhelmingly non-indigenous administration to impose new taxation.

Wherever the blame may lie for the illiteracy of the masses, the fact remains that in the face of such ignorance and of the existence of interests so diversified and widely scattered, a central parliament becomes an impossibility. One cannot imagine the Baluch representative in an assembly at Delhi being keen on the needs of Madura, or a Bombay member advocating measures for the development of shipping in Calcutta. The well-known difficulties as to the representation of very small minorities also come in the way. While a mighty minority of many millions, like the Mahomedans, could protect its own interests in a central institution, the smallest and least influential communities, usually to be found in one province, could exert little or no influence at Delhi or Simla.

It should be remembered that the greatest political mistake in Indian annals was when Aurangzeb overthrew the independent states of the South and tried the impossible task of

bringing the whole of India under Delhi. Historically, neither in Buddhist, Hindu, nor Mahomedan times has the entire peninsula been under one single government, and the actual India of to-day contains provinces that were never ruled by either Asoka or Akbar. And to their honour let it be said that, so far, the majority of Indian thinkers have advocated, if not the form, at least the facts of federal government. No doubt, the fear of seeing India again breaking up into component parts has made some Indian thinkers somewhat dubious as to the future under provincial autonomy. As the examples of the United States and Germany on the one hand, and of Russia on the other, have shown, the real danger of a break-up does not come from meeting the wishes of the different component parts, but from over-centralisation and the enforcement of an unnatural uniformity. No, the problem of a free India within the British Empire can only be solved by federalism and by facing this essential fact.

Of course no contemporary federal scheme can be followed in all its details ; there must be adaptation to Indian conditions and historical developments. Before going into details it should be observed that we must not be deflected from acceptance of certain broad principles of federalism because they happen to be applied in Germany, any more than we are called upon to adopt them because the United States of America are their earlier home. I yield to no one in the intense horror and detestation I feel in respect to the remorseless barbarity, the disregard of international obligations as to the rules of war, the treachery and trickery, and the enslavement of the inhabitants of conquered areas which have disgraced the German name in the last four years. But the political, like the theological, investigator should "seize the truth where'er 'tis found," whether in the New World or the Old, and must not be blinded to the advantages of certain principles of confederation because they happen to have been applied in a country which has brought so much sorrow and suffering upon mankind.

The bursting of the floodgates of German lust of conquest was due, not to the constitution of her federal system, but to the arrogance and egotism instilled into her people, of set purpose, for a generation past. It is notorious that all classes, and not merely the military and ruling castes, were eager for war. They had grown rich in material things too quickly after the unification of the Empire, and acquired the aggressiveness characteristic of *nouveaux riches*. In the pre-war decade I frequently met middle-class Germans, not of the Junker class, but traders in India and Burma, the Dutch Colonies, in Siam, China, Japan, America, in various parts of Africa, and on the Continent. They did not conceal their intense longing for war, and usually they blamed the weakness of the Kaiser, derisively calling him "the Pacifist." It is my firm conviction that if Germany had a Government directly responsible to parliament and removable thereby, the war would have come several years sooner, and probably in 1906 over the question of Morocco.

Wherever we may look for patterns, I now propose to show that for some years to come each Indian province in the initial stages of federalism, must have a constitution that provides, on the one hand, for an independent and strong executive, responsible to the Viceroy and the Secretary of State for tenure of office and appointment ; and, on the other hand, for elective assemblies to control finance and legislation. Thus will be built up the future United States of India within the British Empire. This system, leaving the component members of the federation full local autonomy, will best conform to the varied needs of the great peninsula and to the facts of her evolution, and can most readily be adjusted to local conditions.

PROVINCIAL REORGANISATION

Anyone acquainted with recent Indian political history is aware that nearly all suggested plans of constitutional reform are based on a greater or less degree of provincial autonomy. Lord Hardinge's Government, which included two warm

champions of real devolution in the late Sir John Jenkins and Sir Ali Imam, laid down this principle in unequivocal terms in the famous Delhi despatch of 1911. Most of the outstanding and detailed reform proposals submitted to the Viceroy and Mr. Montagu last winter were based on the claim of provincial autonomy, at least over recognised and limited fields. This, too, was the key-note of Mr. Gokhale's political testament, which I had the privilege of publishing shortly before the announcement in the House of Commons of the liberalising policy of His Majesty's Government. Though it leaves the Governor-General in Council for the present great powers of intervention in the affairs of the local Governments, the Gokhale scheme was designed to lead, after a few years of practical working, to a form of federalism.

Though my lamented friend wrote out his plan only a few days before his death, he had long pondered deeply thereon, and had discussed the various points both with the late Sir. P.M. Mehta and myself. He began expounding his ideas on this head to me in London in the early autumn of 1914. Recognising that the scheme led to federalism, I drew his attention to the consideration that the existing provinces had grown out of the accidents of foreign acquisition and the needs, many of them no longer operative, of bureaucratic administration ; in area, population, and still more potent matters of race and language, they were ill adapted to become national states. I proposed that he should found his scheme as far as possible on a plan of reshapement providing a national and linguistic basis. I said that self-government must develop on two lines, one being that of provincial rearrangement with something like the unity of a nationality as far as practicable, and the other the separate representation within each province of religions, castes, and communities, small as well as great. Gokhale agreed with this view, and his skeleton plan recognises the need for separate and direct representation of Mohamedans and other non-majority communities. But he did not feel justified in making provincial regrouping a part of his scheme, because he hoped that the government would introduce, within

a year or two from that date, the provincial autonomy foreshadowed in the Delhi despatch, and that its working, by bringing out the defects of present geographical divisions, would lead to the establishment of ethnic and linguistic groupings.

Now that the war has gone on not only months but years beyond the time Gokhale anticipated, even in his least optimistic hours, the currents of political progress to which men direct their gaze for the future have gained cumulative force, and the foundations to-day must be laid deep and strong. Happily, the task in India, if earnestly faced, does not present insuperable difficulties. I strongly oppose the suggested subdivision of the existing provinces into a considerable number of self-governing states, Such small administrations would unduly narrow down national effort. The unit of provincial self-government must be equal at least to a medium European state. It seems to me that in the Bengal Presidency we have a good example of a suitable and reasonable homogeneous area for federal autonomy. Nor would I divide so ethnically distinct a province as Burma. But in the other major provinces readjustment is necessary. Behar should absorb a few districts from the Central Provinces, and the United Provinces should take from what is now the Nagpur Government the Hindi-speaking districts which were formerly under the Agra Administration. On the other hand, two or three of the western districts of the United Provinces belong by affinity to the Punjab.

The Bombay Presidency as now constituted is unduly heterogeneous. With the disappearance of the Central Provinces the Marathi-speaking divisions would naturally fall to Bombay. The great Southern province of Madras would not be greatly changed, excepting that is most north-western districts would fall to Bombay, being nearer the Belgaum and North Kanara districts in character than to the Dravidian south. Bombay would lose Sind, which would substantially help to form what might be called the Indus Provinces, possibly with Quetta as the capital, and comprising the North-West Frontier

Province as well as Baluchistan. Apart from Assam we should thus have eight "major" provinces, roughly equal in area, and each capable of developing a national government. It is true that in Bombay there would be the two main varieties of the original Sanskrit in the Marathi and Gujarati dialects ; and in Madras Tamil and Telugu would similarly form the major languages, Everywhere beyond the areas where it is the principal vernacular Urdu would be the recognised home tongue of the Mahomedans. But these and other linguistic variations are inevitable ia a subcontinent so diversified as India ; and by such a scheme of redistribution there would be much greater approximation than at present to provinces which could honestly be called nationalities, each having an importance and coherence ranking with those of at least some European States.

The Governor of each province should directly represent the Sovereign and hold all official executive responsibility. His powers, while similar to those now vested in the heads of presidencies, would be much laarger and far less trammelled by the central authority in India. The appointment would be made, as at present, by the King Emperor. In one important respect I dissent from most of the systems which have been proposed, for I consider the time has come for including Indians within the field of selection. I grant that there are not many Indians who could fitly hold this exalted office in the reconstituted form ; but a beginning could and should be made. The arguments used by Lord Morley a decade ago in wearing down the opposition to appointing Indians to the Government of India and the presidency Executives, may be applied to this claim that, in confirmity with the great principles of Queen Victoria's Proclamation of 1858, Indians should now preside over provinces side by side with Englishmen.

The innovation should be made by inviting one of the ruling princes to leave his own territory for five years for the greater field of direction of a provincial administration. To take a

concrete case, there is no reason why that patriot-statesman the Maharaja of Bikanir should not succeed Lord Pentland or Lord Willingdon. There are certainly other ruling princes capable of administrating great provinces; but I take His Highness of Bikanir as a shining example, whose qualifications cannot be denied. As to the objection that five years is too long a period for any prince to leave his own territory, it may be answered that a well-run Native State reaches such a degree of automatic good administration that, when its ruler dies, the standard is maintained during long periods of regency. Moreover, nowadays there are usually either heirs-apparent or other relatives of the ruler who could well be trusted to carry on the administration for a quinquennium.

During the period the selected ruling chief would undergo a personal metamorphosis; but I am confident that our best modern princes are quite capable of adapting themselves to such a change of situation. They will be able to play their new part and take up their wider responsibilities, exactly as an Englishman forgets that he is a large landowner in Kent or Surrey when he becomes a governor or ambassador. On a small scale something of the king occurred when the gallant Maharaja Sir Partap Singh abdicated the Idar *gadi*, and returned to Jodhpur to be regent for his grand-nephew. The English heads of neighbouring provinces would find substantial advantage in the contiguity of an Indian ruler of proved administrative ability, dealing with public problems correponding to his own. Later on ordinary British Indian subjects should be eligible for appointment to governorships; but for some years to come the great responsibility should be limited to Indian princes. It may be undesirable to appoint a ruling chief to the governorship of the province in which his State is situated; but there is no reason why a prince from Rajputana or Cenral India should not make an excellent head of the Executive in Bengal, Bombay, or Madras.

The Governor should appoint ministers to the various departments of State for defined periods of say, four or five years at

least, and his choice should be unhampered. Except in the peculiar Helvetian Confederation, no Prime Minister or President in the world has to accept his colleagues at the bidding of an electorate or the legislature. Nor is the exception absolute: for when a federal councillor or minister has been elected, his tenure of office does not depend upon any vote for the Swiss Parliament. The world-wide practice whereby the head of the administration selects his colleagues is based on historical experience, and must be maintained in India. By way of safeguard, however, the legislature might possess the right of removing by a three-fourths majority, an unsuitable or incompetent man at the head of a department. Apart from this minor and negative degree of legislative control, each minister should be entirely responsible to the Crown through the Governor. This would give India the constitution Gokhale and Mehta always advocated, on the basis of the American or the German principle of freedom of the executive from legislative control so far as tenure of office is concerned. An adverse vote would only lead to the dropping of measure in hand.

The greatest mistake made in the successive reconstitutions of Indian provincial legislatures has been that of limiting the right of representation, in practice if not always in theory, to what may be termed the privileged classes—the best-educated and richest sections of the population. Owing to this serious error the national conservatism necessary to the evolution of a normal modern State, and in India characteristic of the man at the plough, has been artificially prevented from making its voice effectively heard. An exaggerated mid-Victorian form of Liberalism, natural to the classes that now form the narrow electorates, has been dominant. Taxation and representation have not gone together. The provincial legislatures have been far too small to be really representative bodies in such large areas. I am sure an able and popular Governor, such as Lord Willingdon in Bombay, could rule his province much better if he had an assembly of from 180 to 220 almost entirely elected members, instead of about one-fifth of that number nominated and elected, as now, for it could then be representative of every district, community and substantial interest.

Each of the various religions and races, as recorded in the census, would provincially be a *millet*, to use the Turkish term, and each would have a fair share in the assembly directly elected. The franchise might be based on various grounds—a small income or land tax assessment, public service, both civilian and military. education and other tests. Old soldiers of a prescribed period of service, especially all who have participated in the present war, men who in various capacities have travelled far out of India, and those who have served in importtant posts would have special qualifications for the franchise, but each within his own community. There would still remain large numbers of the less fortunate classes and castes who could not at present be fairly represented, since they do not include any substantial proportion of men with such educational or other qualifications as to pass the reasonable tests applied to other sections. For the present, therefore, it should be the duty of the Governor to nominate a few representatives from these backward communities.

Such an assembly, though falling short of the wide bases of such outstanding types as the House of Commons or the French Chamber, would have the merit of truly reflecting Indian conditions of to-day. I am not advocating an institution for twenty or thirty years hence, but one that could safely and advantageously be introduced without delay, since it would be calculated to strengthen the Executive and promote the contentment of all classes. A natural organic epitome of existing conditions, it would grow, as all healthy political institutions have grown, till it reached a standard similar to that built up stage by stage in the best-governed parts of the world. Since Mahomedans and the land-owning classes received special representation under the Morley reforms, and as a matter of practical politics it is impossible to force the Mahomedan to surrender these rights, this principle must be extended, both on logical and political grounds, to other important communities and interests. This extension would meet the claims, so strongly pressed within the last year or so, of the non-Brahmans of Madras, and of the British and Anglo-Indian communities, as well as of other

minority elements, and would stimulate an interest in public affairs on the part of the backward classes.

While the Assembly, apart from the three-fourths vote of censure by whi h it could remove individual ministers, would not otherwise control the Executive, it would have full powers within its legitimate sphere of influence. But single Chamber government is to be deprecated, and I strongly advocate the establishment in each province of a Senate or Upper House, of, say, forty or fifty members. Here again, for the present, nomination would be exercised in some instances, while in other cases important bodies or interests, such as the greater municipalities, chambers of commerce, universities, and landlords' associations, would send representatives. Europeans sojourning for long periods in India for commercial or professional purposes would have direct representation in the larger Chamber, and indirect representation in the Upper House. The two Houses, in case of difference of opinion, would vote together as a united assembly, and the point at issue would be decided by a majority. The second Chamber should be constituted *pari passu* with the reconstitution of the existing legislature

The power of the two Houses over legislation and provincial finance should be subject only to the veto of the Governor. But provincial finance and its sources of revenue will have to be carefully marked out, since the present system whereby the Government of India, or rather the Secretary of State, is the ultimate disposer of these revenues must disappear. At the same time, as a later chapter will show, care must be taken to leave the character of the Government of India sufficiently elastic to provide for ultimate and natural development from a purely British-Indian to a fully South Asiatic federal administration. Once we have the provinces based on nationality, worked out as described, we can well leave them a full measure of self-government for their internal affairs, such as applies to the greater Native States, for example, Hyderabad or Mysore. There would be little for the central Government to interfere

with. and that little would be statutorily restricted as time went on.

An objection to be met is that since separate representation may strengthen centrifugal tendencies it is inconsistent with the general language and race bases of provincial readjustment. The answer is that we must legislate to meet actual rather than ideal conditions. The various religions, communities, castes, et cetera, within each great province have very much in common, something national in effort and aspiration, that will meet the difficulty of separate communal representation in practical working and in time. On the other hand, the smaller communities by being assured from the first of their voice in affairs will feel growing confidence in the autonomous system, and the self-respect and self-confidence so necessary to the backward classes in India will steadily grow. There will be awakened in them an enthusiasm for great public interests that now lies dormant, and an increasing fellow-feeling with the leading communities.

A few years' experience of this system would go far to satisfy the crying needs of India. The diversified problems of education, sanitation, public works, commerce and industry would be solved by each State in a natural, healthy way. Each would develop itself sufficiently to become an independent and worthy member of the great South Asiatic Federation destined to take its place by the side of the other dominions within the Empire of the King.

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

As previously indicated, after the grant of autonomy to each newly constituted national State the Government of India would retain temporarily powers of general control over the provincial administrations. But this would be only for the purpose of carrying out with each province individually the various conventions by which authority over the whole series of legislation, finance, and administration comprehended in the term "Home Affairs" would be completely transferred to the

constitutional bodies previously described, with the Governor possessing a veto over legislation and finance. If an Assembly rejected the annual budget, the Governor would be entitled to carry on with a repetition of the previous year's financial policy and the existing taxes, as in Japan and Austria.

While, on the one hand, the conventions would assure Home Rule to the State administrations, on the other hand, they would conserve to the central authority those Imperial and federal powers without which the confederacy would go to pieces. We have the historical fact of the existence of major Native States, such as Hyderabad, with treaty rights ; and such internal powers as are vested in the Nizam's Government should be exercised by the provincial States. Of the departments retained by the central Government, the first and foremost would be those of close relationship with the Imperial Government in London, through the Secretary of State for India. His position would more and more approximate to that of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and his Council would be abolished. The right now exercised by the Presidency Governments to correspond with the Secretary of State on certain matters would apply to all the national States ; though naturally the interest of the British Cabinet would be much greater in those branches of the administration which would fall to the central Government. Prominent amongst them would be foreign affairs. By this I do not mean relations with the Native States, which are now part of the work of the Foreign department at Delhi, but with external countries, including such future States as may be drawn hereafter within the orbit of the confederation through their own freewill and interest.

The Army and Navy would naturally belong to the central Government, and so would maritime affairs generally, including customs. Here some sacrifice on the part of certain Native States will be necessary, for just as the central Government would cede to the provincial authorities all those branches of internal business now administered by the principalities, so the principalities, in conjunction with the provincial States, would

have to accept full military and naval and customs control by the Government of India. But this need not interfere with the sentimental connection of each State with its contingent to the Imperial Army. While full control of promotion, brigading, et cetera, would remain in the hands of the central authority, the contigents raised in Native States would carry symbols of their origin, and the princes would be honorary commanders of their respective corps. Apart from customs, the Government of India would receive a settled contribution from each province. In the case of Native States the old and rather humiliating "tribute" paid in some instances, and now amounting to about £617,000, would be abolished and replaced by a uniform percentage of contribution equal to that paid by the provincial States. Public works and sanitation would belong to each province, but railway administration and finance, with uniformity or fair adjustment of rates over the whole extent of the federation, would be a branch of Imperial government.

This system would possess the great advantage of enabling the most progressive provinces to go ahead in their social legislation, without being restricted, as would often be the case under a uniform system, to the peace of the slowest and most backward. In an all-India legislature a project of social reform, such as Mr. Bhupendranath Basu's Civil Marriage Bill, is almost inevitably judged from the point of view of the provinces least prepared for the advance. Under this scheme of federation education in all its branches, social laws (such as those of succession and marriage), control over the building of tenements and conditions of labour, agricultural improvements, scientific research and medical aid—progress in all these vital interests would become a matter of healthy competition. Each province, while able to adapt its policy to local conditions, would be stirred to do its utmost to lead in the race for political and social development. No longer cribb'd, cabin'd, and confined by the central secretariats, the advanced parts of the country, such as Bombay or Bengal, may be expected to reach a standard of social polity that will be a beacon light for the other provinces to follow.

The headship of the Government of India would naturally remain with the representative of the King-Emperor, the Viceroy, to whose position the next chapter is devoted. Then would come his Cabinet, presided over by the Prime Minister, and containing members for Defence, Finance and Customs, Railways, External Commerce, Foreign Affairs, and two Ministers for the Interior. One of these would have charge of all relations with the federated authorities and the other would deal with the judicial, legal, constitutional, and other branches of federal affairs not otherwise provided for. Here again the principle of selection for the Cabinet proposed for the provincial administrations would apply. The Prime Minister, under the Viceroy's guidance, would choose his colleagues without restraint as he thought best.

In what is now known as the Imperial Legislature the most radical change will be inevitable. For the short transitional period before the Government of India relinquishes detailed control of the provinces, a strong central legislature, with special representation of the various provinces and races, to help with the conventions, will be necessary. But after the due establishment of the federal constitution, the room for Imperial legislation and as distinct from questions of policy, will be so restricted that my preference is for a Senate or Council, representing the provinces and the Native States, instead of needlessly complicating the federal organisation by the creation of two central chambers, with little to legislate about.

To this body each of the great provinces should send eight to ten representatives, some chosen by the Governor and approved by either one or the other House, and the remainder selected by each of the Assemblies and approved by the Governor. The great States like Kashmir, Mysore, or Gwalior would send five representatives, and Hyderabad, as the premier State, seven ; and even the smallest State whose rule is included in the table of salutes would have at least one member. As in the German constitution, where the Federal Council safeguards the interests of every member of the Bundesrat by giving to

the smallest representation far above its numerical proportion, so here the medium States, such as Bikanir and Patiala, would have two or three representatives, coming down to at least one member for such principalities as Janjira or Morvi.

The Senate would legislate for the whole of India when necessary ; but the proposed federal constitution will make such occasions rare or formal. They would ordinarily be confined to measures such as the Defence of India Act, or dealing with the protection of the coast, or tariffs, or Army and Navy services. The Government of India, in exercise of full fiscal autonomy, would establish for the entire federation the necessary tariffs with scientific schedules. The English Liberal, with his traditional mistrust of tariffs, too often forgets how totally different is the case of India from that of his own country. He knows that in England Protection would mean, in practice, mainly a tax on corn, and result in raising the cost of various foodstuffs for the poorest classes. Her dependence on exterior supplies has been most pointedly demonstrated by the submarine campaign. In India, on the contrary, the food of the people is home grown, and a very considerable surplus remains for shipment abroad ; the imports consist to a great extent of articles of luxury or such manufactured articles as can safely be taxed in order to encourage indigenous industry.

Under the new order of things the atmosphere of Simla or Delhi should be serene and dispassionate. The Government of India would be the connecting bond between great national provinces and principalities, united for common purposes but varying in organic and natural unity, representing their diversified history, races, religions, and languages. They would be not like to like, but like in difference :

Not chaos like together crushed and bruised,
But, like the world, harmoniously diffused,
Where order in variety we see,
And where, though all may differ, all agree.

The central federal authority, by promoting happiness, contentment, and development within its vast territories and over such an immense population, would sooner or later attract its neighbours in Northern and Western Asia. The benefits of federalism would soon be felt, since it would give a stimulus to progress which present conditions of centralisation discourage and retard. At the periodical Imperial Conferences in London, the representatives of Canada, Australia, and the other great Dominions, would meet those who would voice the claims of an immense Indian Federation built on the rock of national autonomy in each of its living members. They would represent an organic whole which, in very truth, would be a living and vital entity with common interests, looked after by a federal Government and a strong Imperial Executive supervised by the Emperor's representative, the Viceroy, and his Prime Minister and Cabinet, and supported by the Federal Council representing all provinces and principalities.

THE VICEROYALTY

It is an accepted principle of modern statesmanship that the nation or federation of nations should be as broadly based as circumstances permit upon the opinion of the people, that the larger and more varied the foundations of the national life are made, the stronger will be the body politic The Reform Act of 1918, enfranchising women and adding millions of men to the British electorate, notwithstanding the probability of mistakes here and there under the influence of these new elements, is yet certain to increase the strength of the realm by giving large numbers a personal and direct interest in the public welfare. Even the governing classes of Prussia and its Court, whose sympathy with democracy is merely opportunist, have come to the conclusion that by the conferment of manhood suffrage the Constitution and the monarchy will gain strength rather than lose it. In India, under the system proposed in these pages, the suffrage will be as wide as is reasonably practicable. Hundreds of thousands of the people will gain a new sense of responsibility in public affairs, and will be stimu-

lated to take an active interest in the internal administration of the country.

While such widening of the base is essential, we must not overlook the importance of the apex. Without unity of influential guidance national life is inevitably wanting in organic energy. But in searching for the apex of society, as in searching for a reformed Constitution, we must be guided by the history, the character, and the experience of the nation or race. The Presidency of the United States is a fine example of a naturally evolved institution in keeping with the conditions of the soil. But for India, for manifold historical, racial, and even religious reasons, the monarchy can be the only ultimate apex. In spite of innumerable differences of race, character, and psychology, in a very real sense (certainly as real as the claim of episcopal succession from St. Peter made by the Roman and Anglican Churches) our King-Emperor is in the line of succession from Asoka and Chandragupta.

This is so because from time immemorial, in periods of peace and happiness, India has had in practice its federal sovereigns and its over-lord. It is true that the ancient Hindu monarchy and society had become so weakened a millennium ago and more (probably owing to India's geographical isolation from the then world movements) that in the successive waves Mahomedan invasion from the North the ancient polity was overthrown. For a long time thereafter Hindu and Moslem political history in India reveals an unconscious attempt on the part of dynasties, principalities, and nations to recreate the common Empire which had been dissolved long before. The men of genius among the Afghan and other dynasties that "had their day and ceased to be" obviously searched for a constitution that would leave local power in the hands of the many rajas, and yet unite their forces for common effort under the central power at Delhi.

Akbar at last, in part by his own military and administrative genius (as carefully shown in Mr. Vincent Smith's lately published critical biography), but infinitely more owing to the

working of eight hundred years of historical causes, re-established the position of national emperor. Innumerable national, dynastic, racial, and historical factors culminated in the Great Mogul ; but even under his rule seeds were sown that led to a disintegration as widespread as any that took place before his day It was perhaps inevitable that this ambitious conqueror should over-centralise ; but his two much less able successors carried that policy still further. Even the judicious policy of marrying Hindu princesses encouraged the tendency, for many of the rajas whose families had thus become matrimonially linked with the splendid Court of Delhi gradually sunk into the position of nobles instead of retaining that of federal allies.

With Aurangzeb the policy of excessive centralisation culminated. The foolish conquest of the Southern kingdoms, and not religious bigotry, was the real cause of his prolonged conflict with the Hindus of the Deccan. Had he been content to leave the rich kingdoms of Bijapur and Golconda unannexed, it is probable that one of two things would have happened, each equally satisfactory from the point of view of Imperial consolidation. Either the Moslem dynasties of the South would have identified themselves more and more with their Hindu subjects, much as the early Nizams did, and ultimately the Southern kingdoms would have been federated with the empire-nation at Delhi. The other eventuality, that of the Mahrattas under Sivaji wiping away the local dynasties, would still have meant the establishment of a powerful confederacy in the South, but with a natural and inevitable attraction toward the empire of the North. Sooner or later, they would have united for common purposes, while each kept its own internal independence and national character. After careful study of Indian history from the rise of Akbar onwards, I have no hesitation in attributing the break-up of the Mogul Empire and the terrible anarchy of the eighteenth century mainly to the centralising policy of Akbar, Jehangir, Shah Jehan, and Aurangzeb.

I do not suggest that the alternative policy of leaving the principalities independent and bringing about a federal system

would have relieved India of internal differences, wars, and complications, any more than it did the Holy Roman Empire of approximately the same period ; but I hold that national greatness and freedom would have been maintained. There were not in India, as in Europe, two strong states and dynasties like Prussia and Austria, the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs, to fight a hundred battles till one of them was turned out of the Empire, to return later to the ancient fold, but as an ally. There was no danger that India would see any such drama on her soil as the long-drawn tragedy of which the last act was played at SaJowa. The Moguls were the strongest and best organised of the forces existing in the peninsula, and in the pursuit of a federal policy they would have drawn around them, as planets, the Deccan States and Bengal, the principalities of Rajputana, and the newly born nationality of Afghans.

Fate decreed otherwise. From the death of Aurangzeb to the close of the eighteenth century the history of India is among the blackest in the annals of modern times. For all effective purposes the Mogul Empire had passed away. Hence Nadir Shah or Ahmed Shah Abdali could ravish the beautiful provinces of the North, kill Hindu and Moslem alike, and fritter away wealth and resources they could not but abuse. The tragedy of the triangular rivalry and bloodshed of Sikh, Hindu, and Moslem, so useless and insensate, in the Punjab, has never been painted by a capable historian in the dark colours it deserves. The Kings of Oudh, incompetent and ever looking to foreign alliances for support, destroyed the unity of a province designed by nature to be the right arm of the Empire. Disunited Bengal was the theatre of internecine war until the East India Company, obtaining the Dewani, established absolute and, at that time, by no means too benevolent rule. The southern half of India was degenerating into a vast jungle with the Pindari and the Mahratta ravaging provinces and states in all directions. Amid all this internal unrest the long-drawn contest of various European Powers for supremacy went on, and in particular the English and the French made the South the battleground for the settlement of their European differences.

Still the forces of ordered progress, so dear to the heart of mankind, were triumphant. In spite of a hundred checks and many errors, in spite of individual acts of harshness and injustice that no impartial student can deny, Britain raised India to the status of a great empire. As centuries of disorder and division had led to ultimate union under Akbar, so the generations of disaster and disintegration that followed the decay of the Mogul Empire led by imperceptible degrees to the union of India under Great Britain. That union has grown ever closer till to-day, in a sense more real than Akbar ever reached, George V is the successor of Asoka. In the British dynasty we have an imperial apex of Indian rule historically suited to the soil. The latter half of the nineteenth century was characterised by the constantly growing attachment of the people of India to the British Sovereign. Victoria, in the course of her long reign, came nearer to the hearts of the Indian subjects she loved so well than any of the Emperors the great peninsula had had in the last thousand years of her chequered history.

The many princes who visited the Court of Windsor during Her Majesty's reign took back to their territories, both personally and through their entourage, memories of her sincere and maternal affection for her Indian subjects. Her kindness and consideration towards such ordinary Indians as came near the presence, her employment of Indian personal servants, the pains she took to acquire a working knowledge of Hindostani —all this became widely known and appreciated in India. Peasants whom no one would credit with such knowledge often surprised Indians of education by their shrewd remarks on the Good Queen's affection for their country. The many years the Duke of Connaught spent in high military command in India, making friends everywhere, getting known to and learning to understand the people, wove further personal links with the Sovereign. The visits, first of the late King Edward when Prince of Wales, and later of the Duke of Clarence, were welcome reminders of the interest of the Royal Family in the country and its peoples.

This sentiment of attachment to the Crown, so consonant with Indian tradition and religious belief, has come to still fuller fruition under our present gracious Sovereign, who is as well known to and as well beloved by his Indian subjects as any emperor could desire. His first visit to India, as Prince of Wales, with its message of Sympathy, and still more his second visit as regnant Emperor, with its message of Hope, are ever near and dear memories to the hearts of the people. The Great War, with its community of sacrifice and suffering, with the ready and unfailing example of patriotic service and self-denial set by the monarch, and the evidences of his deep personal interest in the Indian troops in every theatre of conflict, has deepened and extended this great personal influence of the Royal House. The many Indian princes, gentlemen, soldiers, and others who have had the privilege of coming into contact with His Majesty--and their number has been much increased during the war—have been so many means of communion between the Emperor and his Eastern dominion. The feeling that, after all, India is not governed on the inconceivable theory of her vast conglomerate population being subject to another race, thousands of miles away, but owes allegiance to her own Emperor, is a unifying source of strength. The monarchy is the natural and fitting apex to the political structure, and must remain so amid all coming permutations. To cold casuists, hair-splitting in their studies, the Indian feeling of warm affection for the Sovereign may seem illogical ; but it is one of the great formative forces of the world.

The Viceroy is the only direct representative of the Sovereign in the country. At the same time he is Prime Minister, the head of the executive, the authority to whom the provincial Governors and Lieutenant-Governors appeal for direction and counsel, the president of the Supreme Legislature, the Foreign Minister, and the chief connecting link with His Majesty's Government in Whitehall. He has so many other duties and heavy responsibilities that it is impossible for him,

however great his capacities, to provide more than a relatively small proportion of the benefits derivable, either for England or for India, from the position of the Emperor's direct representative. The ordinary newspaper accounts of Viceregal doings and speeches are sufficient to show that the Governor-Generalship, the headship of the Executive, absorbs the major part of the Viceroy's time and thought. While in common parlance he is always known by the latter deignation, it is not used in the warrant of appointment issued by the Crown, although in Royal Proclamations both titles are expressed. The standard official authority tells us that the title of Viceroy "appears to be one of ceremony, which may most appropriately be used in connection with the state and social functions of the Sovereign's representative."[1]

With the establishment of any federal constitution, a great change must come over the work of the Viceroy in any case. The time and thought now given to the supervision of provincial administration must be directed more fully to strictly Imperial affairs. Ought not the opportunity to be taken to make a still more radical change, with the object of no longer leaving undeveloped the signal powers for good of the attachment of the people to the Royal House? If the political head of the federal Government at Delhi or Simla is to maintain a united Cabinet and promote a common policy, why should not India accept the experience of every other part of the world that a Prime Minister cannot also successfully play the role of viceroyalty?

These considerations, and the natural desire to make permanent the unifying bond of attachment to the Royal House, lead to the conclusion that the time has come to appoint to the viceregency a son or brother of the Sovereign, and to make the tenure non-political. The Royal representative would have his Prime Minister nominated at the same time, and for the same period of five years or so, by the Imperial Government in England ; and the Viceroy and the Prime

1. *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Vol. IV, p. 16.

Minister would choose their British and Indian colleagues of the Cabinet. The only argument seriously advanced against appointing a member of the Royal Family as a non-political Viceroy when this suggestion was definitely made by myself[1] and others a dozen years ago was that the field for his activities would be insufficient to justify the additional expenditure. This pseudo-reasoning sounds strange from the lips of Britons who have become so familiar for generations with the benevolent activity and unifying influence of a non-political and nation-representing monarch. An examination of only a few of the many advantages of this change will suffice to show that the argument is not only unsound in itself, but starts from a false premise.

In the first place, there would constantly be at the disposal of federal princes and the heads of federal provinces, of the Prime Minister and the members of the Cabinet, as a source of reference and advice, a socially superior, an independent mind, kept informed under the Constitution of all important events and policies, and with the right of advising, warning, and suggesting. These are great and beneficent powers, as is proved by the published *Letters of Queen Victoria*, 1837—1861, and by many biographies of the statesmen of her reign. There would be a second and constant mental influence, detached from direct participation in the controversies of the moment, able to throw a new light on the current problems of politics for the benefit of the Ministry. Since the control of Whitehall, now extending to small details, would be replaced to a considerable extent by that of the representatives of the States, provincial and indigenous, and, in the domain of Imperial finance, by that of the Federal Senate, there would be still greater need than at present of a permanent representative of the Throne, watching, advising and, if things went wrong, warning. The position of the prince would raise him above all temptation or suspicion of any such motive as ambition for a

1. "Some Thoughts on the Indian Discontent," *National Review*, February, 1907.

great political future in the Parliamentary arena at home, and he would be looked to as the final judge and arbiter of the most important elements in inter-state relations, namely, those of good taste and good behaviour.

Another consideration has to be urged. We have seen that, in accordance with the principle Parliament laid down no less than eighty-five years ago, if a position can be worthily held by an Indian. he should not be debarred therefform merely on grounds of race. Hence we have urged that appointments to provincial Governorships should not be beyond their reach. Can it honestly be maintained that there are no minds or characters in modern India equal to those of the Viceroys sent out from England ? In intellect and character a Bikanir or a Sinha yield to none. If the Viceroyalty is to remain anything less than a constitutional role, a position due like the monarchy it represents to the symbolic power of hereditary kingship, then it must be open to Indians as well as Englishmen. No self-respecting Indian will allow for a moment mere racial superiority as an argument for the exclusion of his countrymen.

Then there is the immense and almost untilled field of individual social reform, of charity, and of social effort, which cannot be compassed by our present system of political vice-royalties with their absorbing duties. To take only a few instances : do Indian hospitals secure all the encouragement and supervision they merit ? In the widest sense of the term, does not social help—not indeed from race to race or from class to class but from individual to individual—need organisation and encouragement ? The seed which the Dowager Lady Dufferin and Lady Hardinge, to name but two Vicereines, steadfastly sowed India has reached but an infinitesimal growth in comparison both with the need and the possibilities. In all such matters the successive occupants of Viceregal Lodge, Simla, have done their best ; but the conditions render impossible close attention to the social factors which are so important in the up-building of Indian nationality. The Viceroy, immersed in files, "cases," and interviews with secretaries, is locked up

in the summer at Simla, and is still more pressed by administrative duties in the legislative season at Delhi. A non-political Royal Viceroy would be free to travel more frequently, to visit seaside and other resorts, to set the tone of Indian and not merely high official society, and to generally encourage the development of social life in the provinces.

While the princely courts, as previously indicated, would promote art and literature in the widest form, so on an Imperial basis, the Viceroy would be the patron of all that is best in the representation of our emotional life. The two Tagores—the poet and the painter—have shown to Europe what India is capable of, even in these terrible days when everything outside politics is perforce neglected by the State. The Royal Court of Delhi and Simla would be the natural centre for encouragement of the arts. Indian music, both vocal and instrumental, operas, and tragedies appealing to the Indian temperament, would receive the encouragement which, as German history proves, helps to develop national talent and genius in such directions. In a word the Royal Viceroy, as I wrote in the article previously mentioned, "would put himself at the head of the movements, social, literary, economic and artists that improved the relations of all sections of society, that destroyed racial and religious particularisms, that helped to amalgamate the parts into a healthy whole."[1]

ISLAMIC AND TURANIAN MOVEMENTS

The Great War has disposed, once for all, of a modern international bogey. In the early eighties, when Turkey had just emerged from her disastrous encounter with Russia, her European misfortunes were followed by still greater losses in Africa. Her shadowy protection over Tunis was replaced by French rule ; and Egypt, through the bungling of its rulers as well as of the late Sultan Abdul Hamid, was metamorphosed in fact if not in name, into a British possession. In Asia, the Arab tribes were increasingly restive. In such circumstances

1. *National Review*, February, 1907.

the late Professor Arminius Vambery, the Hungarian Orientalist, and other Europeans who had the entree of the Court of Abdul Hamid, let drop words and ideas that led the Sultan into his main political dream of Pan-Islamism. From that day forward, mullahs, fakirs, and other zealous emissaries were all over Asia and Africa preaching the reunion of Islam under Constantinople. The Sultan was encouraged by the astrologer Abdul Huda, as well as by Afghan and Persian readers of portents. Even after the downfall of Hamidism, the Young Turks continued this policy for some years.

Political Pan-Islamism had its foundations on sand, and could not endure. There is a right and legitimate Pan-Islamism to which every sincere and believing Mahomedan belongs—that is, the theory of the spiritual brotherhood and unity of the children of the Prophet. It is a deep, perennial element in that Perso-Arabian culture, that great family of civilisation to which we gave the name Islamic in the first chapter. It connotes charity and goodwill toward fellow-believers everywhere from China to Morocco, from the Volga to Singapore. It means an abiding interest in the literature of Islam, in her beautiful arts, in her lovely architecture, in her entrancing poetry. It also means a true reformation—a return to the early and pure simplicity of the faith, to its preaching by persuasion and argument, to the manifestation of a spiritual power in individual lives, to beneficent activity for mankind. This natural and worthy spiritual movement makes not only the Master and His teaching but also His children of all climes an object of affection to the Turk or the Afghan to the Indian or the Egyptian. A famine or a desolating fire in the Moslem quarters of Kashgar or Sarajevo would immediately draw the sympathy and material assistance of the Mahomedan of Delhi or Cairo. The real spiritual and cultural unity of Islam must ever grow, for to the follower of the Prophet it is the foundation of the life of the soul.

The spread of this spiritual and cultural Pan-Islamism, this true religion of brotherhood and affection, in our time has been promoted by the facilities of modern civilisation, by the

growth of the spirit of liberty, and by the general awakening of the East which began late in the nineteenth century. It had nothing to do with and nothing to receive from the Court of Stamboul. The hopeless theory entertained by Abdul Hamid of reaching political unity among such scattered ard different nationalities was as futile as it would be for the Pope of Rome to dream of gathering the Catholics throughout the world under a common temporal sovereignty. This political Pan-Islamism of the late Sultan was finally swept away on the outbreak of the Great War. Religion has more and more become a spiritual force in the modern world, and less and less a temporal one. In this war national and material interests have predominated over religious ties. The sturdy Protestantism of England and America has come to grips with the Lutherism of Germany and the Calvinism of Hungary. Catholic Austria and Catholic Italy are arch enemies. The Jews of every country have been loyal to the flags of their respective lands.

The same feature has been observable in Islam. But here new aspirations arose. Whether through personal and dynastic ambition or through deeper racial feelings of antipathy, many of the ruling families of the Arabian Peninsula have broken away from Turkey, notwithstanding all the bonds of religion. An independent Arabian monarchy has arisen in Hedjaz and has helped to clear the Red Sea coast of Turkish troops. Just as the Moslem Albanians were eager to obtain autonomy, so the Moslem Arabs have evinced tendencies toward racial home rule. Whether a united Arabian nationality will once again be reared is a question that no man living can answer.

The one thing clear is that the break-up of the Russian Empire and the disappearance of Hamidian and political Pan-Islamism have revealed a new problem. Like the German and slav dreams of national unity has political force, though brought into prominence by events, is not a thing of yesterday. The vast majority of the Russian Moslems are of Turko-Tartar origin and language. In the Caucasus and in Persia there is a large Turkish-speaking Turanian element. The eighties saw a

literary movement begun both in Constantinople and in Asiatic Russia toward a cultural and linguistic rapprochement of the Anatolians and the other branches of the Turanian family. The preliminary efforts were toward grammatical and linguistic renovation, as well as toward bringing out both prose and poetry on modern European principles, to replace the Persian and Arabic metre but in as pure Turkish as possible.

After the still-born Russian revolution of 1905 and the coming into power of the Young Turk, sources of communication and of sympathy grew. With the outbreak of the world war, and the resulting disappointment of the Porte with the failure of political Pan-Islamism, as shown by the Arab revolt, the governing classes in Turkey turned their hopes eastwards towards their Russo-Persian cousins. Perso-Arabic words were more and more dropped, alike in Turkey and amongst the other branches of the Turanian races, and the names of Mongol heroes were more and more given to children. Such cognomens as Jenghir, Timur, Baber, Mangu Ordoghrol, and Hulagu were made fashionable. It is not improbable that when peace is restored Turkey will seek to exert much greater influence than hitherto over communities of related origin in the Caucasus, on the shores of the Volga, and in Central Asia. The same may be said as to her ambitions in relation to the Turki tribes of Persia.

By way of the Sublime Porte, therefore, Germany will endeavour to exercise a powerful influence in the Middle Fast. This serious contingency has to be faced ; but I cherish the assurance that if England is true to her traditional principles of liberty, and respect for national aspirations, there will be no danger of her influence in Asia being successfully challenged. A satisfied, autonomous India, an Afghanistan and a Persia whose independence and future are ensured, and receiving from England such economic, commercial, and cultural assistance as an independent country can have from stronger neighbours without humiliation—these will be far too strong, alike in moral and material forces, to fear anything from the Turanian races of Northern Asia.

Though Germano-Turkish influence is reaching Central Asia, in no part of the Middle East will it find the resources either in men or material to give any chance of attacking the foundations of British dominion in Asia, provided the peoples who go to make up, in the widest sense, these spheres of British influence are satisfied and happy. If we carry out the wise internal policy of founding true national self-government through federalism of all the greater races of India ; if sincere friendship toward Afghanistan is developed ; if toward Persia we follow a genuine policy of helpfulness without any *arriere-pensee* of reducing her right to a national and free government, or making of her a second and impotent Egypt—given these conditions we may be quite sure that the South Asiatic Federation, with England as its friend, protector, and pivot, will be strong enough to meet any aggression, whether from Germanised Turkey or Japan.

The converse proposition may be stated with equal emphasis. The outlook would be most depressing if we took the wrong road of excessive centralisation by an impossible attempt at unilateral instead of federal government in a free India ; of reducing Persian independence to a position like that of Egypt or Morocco ; or of unjustified humiliation of the Afghan national pride. We should thus travel in the direction of reducing the symbol of Britain to the level of that of the Muscovite Tsar. The body politic would be inoculated with the germs of disease, such as would make India in the long run an easy prey to a combination of attack from without and sedition from within. In modern as well as ancient times great empires not built on the stable foundations of freedom, nationality, and justice, have broken down from the blows of smaller but healthier neighbours. It is for us to follow the moral, genuinely disinterested and nation-conserving policy that will make the free South Asiatic Federation of to-morrow one of the great dominions of that free union of nations of which Britain is the heart and the King-Emperor the beloved head.

THE PATH TO WIDER CONFEDERATION

Our survey of international problems affecting India's neighbours may be followed by tracing in fuller detail the intimate connection between satisfactory progress in relations with them and the principles on which Indian constitutional advances, even those of the immediate future, are based. From this and other stand-points, the use of the term "responsible government" instead of "self-government" by Mr. Montagu in the historic announcement to the House of Commons on August 20, 1917, is to be regretted. We know from Lord Curzon (House of Lords, 24th October, 1917) that the terms of the announcement were the subject of "repeated discussion at the Cabinet," and I am convinced that the words "responsible government" were used in order to carry with the Secretary of State and the Prime Minister some more conservative members of the small War Cabinet. It was employed so that the Executive Government hereafter might contain Englishmen, while at the same time the administration became sufficiently liberal to be resonsible to the people. The adjective is unfortunate because it carries the technical meaning of a government responsible for its existence to an assembly elected by the people. On the other hand, "self-government" can comprise many and varied forms of expression of the popular will.

Responsible government, in the narrow and technical sense in which Mr. Montague's announcement is being interpreted in some quarters, has been really successful alone in the United Kingdom, and there only up to a certain point. In England the two-party system, quite inconceivable in India, was held years ago by no less a judge of constitutional history than Bagehot to have been the real cause of the success of this form of government. But in the words of a competent observer to-day "the breakdown of Parliamentary government, which had become increasingly acute in the years preceding the war, was due to the fact that the British people had persisted in attempting in one Parliament and with one executive to deal with three classes of business," *viz.* Imperial affairs ; questions

affecting the United Kingdom as a whole; and the internal affairs of the three countries.[1] Under the stress of war conditions, many of the traditional elements of responsibility of the executive to Parliament are in suspense.

In France, where, for historical reasons, there are many parties, this principle has led to unstable guidance and constant changes in ministries, and has brought to the front in public life a kaleidoscope crowd of individuals instead of a few outstanding national character. France is a very great nation, but a sincere admirer who loves her almost as a foster-mother country may be allowed to say that she is great in spite of her government system. Sympathetic students of the French Constitution, such as Mr. Bodley, and passionate French patriots, such as M. Deroulede, have regretted that the immediate fear of Caesarism led the founders of the Third Republic to adopt the English model instead of that of the other great Anglo-Saxon State.

In Spain this narrow "responsible" form of constitution has led, as it must in any half-educated country where parliamentary institutions are not a tradition of the people, to Rotativism, which, though nominally responsible to the electorate, is the very negation of good government. At this moment, heroic efforts are being made to do away with the system. So long as Portugal was a constitutional monarchy, the same hopeless plan of Rotativism strangled her development; since her change to republicanism constan· revolutions and unrest have succeeded the former national inactivity. In Greece, until Veninzelos, a man of genius, came to the head of affairs, the reality without the name of Rotativism held sway and nearly ruined that small but gifted people.

1. Letter to *The Times*, 5 February, 1918, by Lord Hythe (now Earl Brassey) urging the necessity for a federal form of government in the United Kingdom, both on grounds of efficiency and to provide the one effective solution of the Irish Home Rule problem. This view has gained widespread acceptance since the issue of the Irish Convention report.

On the other hand, who will be so foolish as to say that the United States of America are not composed of self-governing communities; Who will allege that the Federal Government at Washington is not in the truest sense a government of the people, by the people, and for the people? Yet the system by which it exists is diametrically opposed to "responsible government" in the narrow sense. The executive is even more separate and independent of the legislature than in Germany. There the leading ministers are always nominated by King of Prussia as Prussia's representatives to the Federal Council; and thus, in a roundabout way by belonging to the Upper House, they come into contact with the popular assembly. In America Cabinet Ministers are entirely responsible to the President, and by the Consititution at least, have no more influence or part in the acts of the legislature than any ordinary private citizen. Nor are they, as in Germany, of practical necessity members of the Senate.

It would be a disaster for India to be forced into the narrow form of constitutionalism that developed with its essential condition of two great rival parties, in England through historical and natural causes, but in now confessedly in need of reform. Mere imitation of features of the British Constitution, we have seen, has had most disillusioning results in the Iberian Peninsula and in Greece. It is true that a form of responsibility to parliament has succeeded in the Northern States of Europe; but here it must be remembered that in Sweden, the most important of the three Scandinavian Governments, the system is a half-way house between responsibility as understood in England, and the German practice of separation of powers as between the executive and the legislative bodies. Constitutional government has succeeded only where it has been cast in a form natural to the history and development of the people. In America, with all fidelity to democratic principles, it has taken forms widely different from those of Great Britain. In Japan, also, it is in practice anything but a slavish imitation of the English methods. Indeed, it is nearer to the Swedish than to any other system existing in

the west. In Germany and Austria it approaches the American system, though the partition between the executive and the legislature is not so marked.

Why should India be forced to imitate a system of government evolved through many centuries in a geographically small country with two historical parties? Why should India be placed on this Procrustean bed, instead of allowing the more widely elected legislature and an executive with a century and a half of tradition behind it to develop naturally their own inner working, just as they have been evolved in other countries? We want self-government, we want responsible government in the widest sense of the term—that of ultimate responsibility to the people— but we do not want our nascent national institutions to be put into swaddling clothes because one world instead of another was chosen by the British War Cabinet for its public declaration. The Indian peoples, with an instinctive sense of their need, have asked for self-government within the Empire, not for parliamentary institutions on the British model. None of the draft schemes prepared by Indians from that of Gokhale to the joint representation of the National Congress and the Moslem League hypothecate full and immediate responsibility of the executive to the legislature.

It is an unfair and prejudiced criticism of the federal form of government to argue that the free provincial parliaments will be nothing but glorified municipalities. Surely autonomy for our great provinces, with populations of from twenty to fifty millions, with their vast and varied lands, each equal in natural resources to one of the greater European States, is a sufficient field for the ambition and devotion of any patriot. It must be remembered that as true federalists we advocate for the government of each of the great province-states the same measure of ultimate internal independence from the central authorities as is now enjoyed by the Nizam or the Rajput princes over their own territories.

This brings me to the first of two questions I wish to put to the critics of federalism as here advocated. By what other

system can the Native States be brought into active union with the rest of India ? No scheme of reconstruction can be complete without taking into consideration the 70,000,000 people and the 710,000 square miles comprised within these areas scattered all over India. Can these lands remain permanently out of touch with the great reconstructed India of the future ? Or, as an alternative, are we to tear up treaties that assured their princes full autonomy within their respective spheres ? Or is it seriously maintained that the central Government, while scrupulously avoiding interference in any question relating to a tiny principality or its court, should at the same time control the great province-states from Simla or Delhi, as if they were nothing but so may territories occupied by superior forces ? The history of the past, no less than the justice and symmetry to be sought to-day, leads to the conclusion that we need a federation which can be entered by the greatest provinces and the smallest Native Raj alike without loss of internal freedom, and yet with the assurance that, in all federal matters, they will pull together for a united Empire.

Under the system I have advocated, with its checks, balances, and safeguards, there can be little danger of any province falling into misgovernment. It is common ground with students of Indian affairs that a State like Mysore should have full control of internal policy. If this principle holds good of an essentially non-democratic regime, why should it not apply to our great national states, where legislative and financial control is finally vested in a representative assembly, and where the immovable executive is strong enough to carry out measures of justice and utility ?

The second question for the advocate of a unilateral system to ponder is that of the effect on the international future in Asia. An outstanding tendency in the political ferment of to-day is for small nations, while retaining their individuality, together to a central, powerful State that carries them along in a common course. In recent years the United States have drawn into their orbit many of the smaller entities of the New

World, such as Cuba and the republics of Central America. Germany has Austria, Turkey and Bulgaria ranged with her, and she is ambitious to secure within her sphere of influence the States that have been surrendered through the Bolshevist betrayal of Russia. She dreams of ultimately bringing Holland and Flanders, Denmark, Norway and Sweden, and even Switzerland within her constellation. England and France and Italy have now taken a common route in world politics, carrying with them many wide-flung dominions. Even the three Scandinavian monarchies, free as they ordinarily are from the bewildering entanglements of world-politics, have found that practical independence can only be maintained by greater union and cohesion. We have to-day, in fact, a common North European policy, into which the new Republic of Finland longs to be drawn. It has been ruthlessly invaded because it forms a barrier to Teutonic ambitions in North Western Europe. But the most competent observers are agreed that whatever changes peace may bring, Germany will not turn away her eyes from Middle Asia

It is for the Indian patriot to recognise that Persia, Afghanistan, and possibly Arabia must sooner or later come within the orbit of some Continental Power—such as Germany, or what may grow out of the break-up of Russia—or must throw in their lot with that of the Indian Empire, with which they have so much more genuine affinity. The world forces that move small states into closer contact with powerful neighbours, though so far most visible in Europe, will inevitably make themselves felt in Asia. Unless she is willing to accept the prospect of having powerful and possibly inimical neighbours to watch, and the heavy military burdens thereby entailed, India cannot afford to neglect to draw her Mahomedan neighbour states to herself by the ties of mutual interest and goodwill.

A lesson of the Great War that even Germany has been reluctantly compelled to recognise is that force, though remorselessly applied by her military leaders, is insufficient to

secure the incorporation of weakened nations. In Courland, in Lithuania, in Flanders herself, German policy has wavered between merciless severity and efforts to win the hearts of such elements of the population as the Flemings and the Baltes to her *kultur* and interests. British policy ought to have no such conflict of ideals. Hence it is unthinkable that the British Empire can pursue a course of mere conquest in the Middle East. Such a policy is foreign to her ideals and repugnant to her interests It would be more disastrous for England and India than almost anything else I can conceive, for it would mean the violation of the principles of humanity and justice, and would provoke continued unrest. On the other hand, a merely negative attitude will not meet the dangers I have indicated. We must have a policy attractive enough to draw toward our centre State the outer nations. A system of federation, just to each member, united by ties of common interest, would serve as a magnet for them. It would be a great harbour light for any weak state of the Middle East.

Once the internal federation was complete and the economic influence northwards and westwards developed, we might expect the Afghans themselves to seek association therein. The fact that Bengal and Bombay, Hyderabad and Kashmir were enjoying full autonomy, would be a guarantee to the Afghans of no risk of loss of independence in entering the federation. Just as the indigenous rulers of Rajputana would have their place, there is no reason why a group of principalities from Arabia and the Southern littoral of the Persian Gulf, should not ultimately become members of the union that will ensure peace and liberty, freedom and order to the south of Asia. Subsequently, Persia herself would be attracted, and just as the natural pride of Bavaria or Saxony has not been diminished by inclusion within the German Union, so, on a greater and more difficult but happily beneficent basis, the empire of Persia and the kingdom of Afghanistan could honourably enter a federation of which Delhi would be the centre.

Needless to say, no compulsion, direct or indirect, can be employed. The right course is to institute such a type of community of states as to draw the sympathy and practical interest of India's neighbours. The magnet would attract, as time went on, the isolated and remote lands of Nepal, Bhutan, and Tibet. The Crown Colony of Ceylon naturally and historically belongs to India. She is cut off from the mainland by a mere geological accident, and the shallow channels and intermittent rocks that divide her therefrom are already partly, and will soon be completely, bridged by the Indo-Ceylon Railway. A unilateral government of India could have no attraction for the people of the island They would naturally prefer being governed from Whitehall rather than Delhi, for Whitehall, being so much further away, interferes less, while the Parliamentary institutions of England afford Ceylon guarantees in normal times against injustice and needless mandates from without. The autonomous system would give the *coup de grace* to the pleas put forward from time to time for the separation of Burma from the Indian Empire, which spring from dissatisfaction with the present centralised control.

In a word, the path of beneficient and growing union must be bassd on a federal India, with every member exercising her individual rights, her historic peculiarities and natural interests, yet protected by a common defensive system and customs union from external danger and economic exploitation by stronger forces. Such a federal India would promptly bring Ceylon to the bosom of her natural mother, and the further developments we have indicated would follow. We can build a great South Asiatic federation by now laying the foundations wide and deep on justice, on liberty, and no recognition for every race, every religion, and every historical entity.

THE DEPRESSED CLASSES

There is close relation between the low standards of public health discussed in the last chapter and the moral and material degradation of the depressed classes. Our natural sympathy

with the work of amelioration, and our dissatisfaction that fully one-sixth of the people should be segregated and artificially kept out of the main streams of national life, must not lead us to parrot-like repetition of the familiar assertion that the prejudices and sense of superiority of the higher castes is the all-embracing cause of the misery and degradation of the masses. In every part of the world we find a "submerged" class. In India so widespread is the poverty of the people that, judged by Western standards, an overwhelming majority, and not the outcastes alone, can be described as depressed or submerged. Long familiarity with this all-pervading poverty, however, leads to the application of these terms on the basis not of poverty, but of membership of the "untouchable" communities. Henceforth, if the task of national improvement and consolidation is to be taken in hand, we must give a wider meaning to the description of "depressed" than that of the mere position of a number of inferior sections in relation to the Hindu caste system.

A mere hypothesis will make this point clear. We will assume that a great and sudden movement toward social justice led all the Brahman and other castes of Hindu society to receive the outcastes as brothers in faith, and to accept their companionship at gala dinners throughout the land. What would be the position of these unfortunate people on the following day ? No doubt the mere fact of acceptance as the social and spiritual equals of high-caste men would bring a sense of exaltation, and there would be a general widening of national sympathy. Yet in the absence of far-reaching economic improvement, the actual position and standard of life of these unfortunate classes would remain very much what it is at present. The general mass would not be better off, though here and there the door of opportunity to rise might be opened, as, for instance, in the occasional marriage of girls to men of the higher castes.

Even to-day the generalisation that an outcaste cannot escape from his "birth's invidious bar" requires qualification. Whatever the legal disabilities of the depressed classes may

have been when India was a purely Hindu society, for centuries past the power of strictly legal prevention of obtaining a better social position has been enforceable in restricted areas only. Historical instances of the rise of men of lowly origin to power and affluence abound. There is every reason to believe that if under a Lodi, a Babar, an Akbar, or a Shah Jehan, a sweeper raised himself, through superior merit, to wealth and influence, the State would not have allowed the caste hierarchy to drag him down to his former status. The Brahmans would not have had social relations with him ; but such a successful ex-sweeper would certainly come into business contact with his Brahman neighbours, to their material benefit, from time to time. For more than a century and a half the supreme power in India has been exercised by a nation which bases its code of justice on the equality of all men in the eye of the law. In certain provinces or states, and at certain periods of reaction, even within this period, the power of society under hierarchical influence has been exerted to press back some ambitious members of the untouchable classes. But it cannot be seriously maintained that in any British province a sweeper can be restrained from rising to affluence and social position if favourable opportunity is allied to exceptional abilities. The open competitive examination for the Indian Civil Service, and many other tests on a similar basis, know no distinction of caste or creed.

If the artificial restraint has been so small why, it may be asked, are there not more cases of "untouchables" rising to positions of wealth and trust ? The answer is that in a country without compulsory education, and without a form of government giving all classes the subconscious self-respect afforded by the possession of a recognised voice in affairs, social injustice is inevitable. Superstition reigns and the material framework of society is such that it is ordinarily impossible for those who are lowest economically to improve their position, except in such a minor degree as to make the amelioration scarcely perceptible. Nor can the depression be attributed entirely to the pressure of the religious and social system under Brahman

domination ; for it is not to be forgotten that there are many families belonging to the higher castes, sometimes even Brahmans, whose average condition of life is no better than that of the hereditary unfortunates.

It is well known that many members of the depressed classes improve their socio-economic position by embracing Christianity. What does the missionary do to and for the convert besides baptising him ? Very often he is taught to read and write not only the vernaculars, but English. From childhood in Christian families cleanliness and the general laws of health are impressed on him and his. A boy of aptitude is placed in the way of learning, and he may rise, not only to teaching and preaching, but to other learned professions. When such advantages are within reach of each "untouchable" family, economic forces will operate so to raise the backward communities, that, in spite of the prejudices of Brahman orthodoxy, the social position of many of its members will approximate to the level of that of the highest castes. The Brahman could still object, on caste grounds, to intermarriage or intimate social relations with a successful Pariah. Though a religious basis is claimed, the exclusiveness of the Brahman mainly arises from social prejudice. Until within recent years the same attitude of mind was common in Europe. Two or three generations ago a successful Jew was as much an object of aversion on the part of the average country squire in England as a successful Sudra is to the Brahman. In Germany to this day Jews and certain urban classes are looked upon with undisguised social prejudice by the rural gentry. If the economic position of the "untouchable" in India is raised and educational diffusion gives him equality of opportunity with his neighbours, caste prejudice will not be able to depress him or condemn him to treatment any worse than that which was meted to the Jew even in England within living memory.

When all is said, however, there is no running away from the seriousness and urgency of the task of economic and social amelioration. The only object of my preliminary warnings

against the assumption that the mere abrogation of caste rules would effect this reformation, is to emphasise the need for dealing with the problem from every point of view. The patriot and the social reformer must not be content to run after the will-o'-the-wisp of a religious merging, instead of doing the spade work necessary for educational, economic, and social improvement. There is no single short road to that amelioration of the lot of the Pariah which is essential to the upbuilding of Indian nationhood. Concentration of effort on the removal of the more important causes of backwardness is called for, side by side with the devotion and energy of the individual to the cause of his less fortunate neighbours before we can hope to achieve marked progress.

First and foremost, because more important than any other single agency, must be the adoption of a national policy of betterment. Under the influence of the Manchester school theories of the need for strict limitation of State agency were fashionable in mid-Victorian times ; in our day, and after the experience of the last four years in particular, the matter is *res judicata*. A good many years have passed by since Sir William Harcourt declared, "We are all Socialists now." The immense development of communications, the necessity for controlling the conditions of labour, the need for raising money at rates which only the credit of the State can command for the purpose not only of defence but also of reproductive public works—these and other factors attest the recognition by all advanced communities that the moral and material development of the people is one of the main duties of the State. That even amid the clash of arms a Ministry of Health is being set up in the United Kingdom is a forcible reminder that in the most advanced countries the trend of modern society is toward making health, in the widest sense of the term, whether by the study of eugenical improvements or by intensive culture of the individual, the cardinal pursuit of the commonwealth.

The province-state of to-morrow, with its strong and permanent executive, under a Governor whose main business and

duty will be to keep his eyes open for every possible improvement, with its large and popular assembly representing all classes and conditions of the people, must take in hand these problems of general improvement, of raising the standard of health and comfort. It has previously been shown how far free and compulsory education for all, and including physical culture, will go to make it impossible for the population of to-morrow to accept the present conditions of life of the depressed classes.

These classes must be represented in each provincial legislature. Wherever possible they should return their own representatives ; where, in the earlier stages of progress, they are so backward as to make this impracticable, it will be for the Governor to nominate their leaders for the time being. When their political equality is constitutionally recognised, they will themselves gain social self-condfidence, and soon by unconscious stages realise their responsibility toward and value to the commonwealth. Such measures as civil marriage bills will be required in each province. Other measures of social justice will be an indirect result of the recognition in political representation of the legitimate place in the nation of classes without whose humble toil communal life as a whole could not be maintained.

Our main reliance on State action to improve the conditions of life of all the backward elements, whether technically belonging to the depressed classes or not, must lead to no neglect of the great opportunities on every side for voluntary social service. The Christian missionaries have set an example in this respect of what can be achieved by a body of devoted men acting in concert. The Indian Christian community has been doubled in the last three decennial periods ending with the census of 1911, and now represents about 1½ per cent of the entire population ; and this is due far less to natural increase than to the constant accession to its ranks of members of the depressed classes. Further, since 1911 there has been a developing tendency to mass movements towards Christianity, one

of the perplexing problems of the missionary bodies being to make due provision for the reception and education of whole villages desiring enrolment. Though there may be natural regret on the part of educated Indians that people of their own religions are absorbed by a foreign communication, there can be no denying that the social and economic improvement which the missions bring to the poorest of the poor is a great and beneficent work. It calls for Indian sympathy, and still more for Indian imitation.

In early life I thought that the noblest ideal for an Indian Mahomedan of means or influence was to work for the education of his Islamic brethren. For many years now I have held the view that a still greater and nobler work awaits the Indian Moslem. That is the organisation throughout the country—I will not say of "missions," because of the mainly proselytising associations of the word—but of mutual help associations on a national scale, for improving the condition of the depressed classes, irrespective of their religious beliefs. Everyone with influence among them should earnestly pray that the Moslems may have the grace to recognise the need for this labour of love. Since the highest recognition of brotherhood and fellow-citizenship can only come by accepting inter-marriage, at any rate in the present social conditions of India, the Mahomedans would be justified in advancing their religious views amongst those members of the backward classes who were thus brought into touch with them for the work of common regeneration.

The most fitting and important agency, however, for this beneficent task is that of the higher castes among the Hindus themselves, and this has been recognised to some extent by the work in recent years of Hindu missions, especially in Bombay, under the influence of Gokhale and Sir Narayan Chandavarkar. No statement to which the former gave expression was more pertinent to the duty he enjoined both by practice and precept than that the problem of Indian progress is, in the last resort, the problem of raising the Indian average of character and

efficiency. What the Christian missionaries and the Mahomedans can do on a relatively small scale, must here become the most insistent and widespread voluntary work of the most numerous portion of the nation. With high caste Hindus, as with Mahomedans, religious propaganda, the results of which are so often embittering and narrowing, should not be the inspiring motive, but rather the giving of a helping hand to fellow countrymen in trouble whose depression is a serious handicap to the general progress of the Motherland.

If the work is to be effective, it will be necessary to recognise the claims of social equality wherever this is possible, and to remove the embargoes on intermarriage between different sections. The various voluntary organisations, which might also comprise men of other faiths, such, for instance, as the Buddhists, would work in friendly rivalry, not with the mere object of increasing their own numbers by a few thousands, but with that of bettering the social position of the most backward, with a view to realising a common progressive nationality. In the immense fields of secondary and higher education, of special scholarships, and of widening opportunity for artistic and spiritual cultivation, and of facilitating inter-marriage between the different classes—these and other ameliorative agencies will give wide scope for the voluntary energy and patriotism of Hindus, Mahomedans, and Christians alike, when the State fulfils the primary duties of universal elementary education and of due sanitary provision.

VIEWS ON REFORM SCHEME*

I hold no less strongly that in framing the new political order of things statesmanship must take account of the wide differences which separate Hindus and Mussulmans at the present time. These differences are not only religious; they are historical and social, racial and physical and in the latter respect, at least, they soon become marked, even in the case of recent converts to the Moslem faith... I have to admit

**The Times*, 15 February, 1909.

that fulfilment of the ideal of homogeneity lies in a future so distant that it is quite beyond me to predict the date of its arrival...

I trust his lordship will take an early opportunity of making definite his intimation that he may be willing to concede the principle of an exclusively Mahommedan electorate sending their representatives to an exclusively Mahommedan electoral college. Unless this modification of the original plan is effected there cannot be a fulfilment of the pledges given to the deputation... Now is the opportunity for leading Hindus to show a true spirit of patriotism and good will by recognizing that Mahommedan misgivings as to the original scheme are just and reasonable .. By adopting such an attitude they will do far more to lay the foundations of eventual Indian nationality than by clamouring for adhesion to methods which designed no doubt to advance that end, will in reality greatly retard it.

ON CHANGES IN BENGAL AFTER ANNULMENT OF PARTITION IN 1911

The recent changes came so suddenly that it is not strange that the Mussulman public should have hesitated in deciding how it should receive them. That they will have considerable effect on Islam's future destiny in India is an evident truism. Yet I doubt if there be a single individual, outside the small circle of the authors of these changes, who has not passed through different emotions since he heard the royal announcement.

I, for one, however, after a careful consideration of every aspect of the question, have come to the conclusion that the Mussulmans do not lose anything of consequence, while India as a whole and the Empire will gain considerably. The gain of India must be the gain of the Mussulmans of India, provided no direct Moslem interest is attacked. We must take the changes *seriatim*, look at their probable results, and determine how India, and then the Mussulmans of India, will

be benefited, or otherwise, by each. The change of capital in itself will have the great advantage for Mussulmans of bringing the Government of India nearer to the centres of Moslem intellectual activity and to the most virile portions of the Moslem community in India. It will, in the next place, bring the Viceroy nearer to the Muslem University, an institution in the welfare of which as the Chancellor of the University he is directly interested. For India as a whole it will be a great gain that the seat of Government should be, so to speak, in a neutral central position, and removed from any great section of people or province that may have interests of its own not identical with or always friendly to those of other equally great and important sections of people or provinces. For Calcutta, with its great commerce, and tapping as it does the richest 'Hinterland' of Southern Asia, it cannot be anything more than the loss of the social attractions of Government House.

Then comes the undoing of the Partition. No doubt the Mussulmans were in a distinct majority in the province of Eastern Bengal and Assam, and this unique position is now lost. But looking at the position of Islam in India as a whole, I doubt if it will be found that it was a good thing to be in a clear majority in one province and a minority in almost every other. The disadvantages of such a situation are obvious. Islam in India is one and indivisible. It is the duty of a Moslem to look not only to the immediate interests of his own locality but to those of his co-religionists as a whole. But if we look upon it from a still wider point of view as Indians, we shall find that the old Partition had deeply wounded, and not unnaturally, the sentiments of the great Bengali-speaking millions of India. Anything that permanently alienates and offends the sentiments or interests of millions of Indians, be they Moslem or Hindu, is undoubtedly in itself an undesirable thing and should not only be avoided by the Government but also opposed by all communities of India. Viewed in this light, the undoing of the Partition which has satisfied the great Bengali-speaking people ought to

be in itself a cause of congratulation for all Indians, whether Hindus or Mussulmans, and I think we should all be deeply grateful to His Excellency Lord Hardinge for this great act of statesmanship which has removed a grievance from one important section of His Majesty's Indian subjects. From the point of view of the greater good of India and the Empire, the removal of the capital and the undoing of the Partition, or, rather, the creation of two new provinces, have been master-strokes of statesmanship.

But there still remains the question of the real needs of the Mussulmans of Eastern Bengal and Assam. These needs can all be summed up in one word—'education'. However, since Lord Hardinge's Government has promised a University for Dacca—a University that we most sincerely hope will be a teaching and residential one—I doubt if there is left upredressed any real grievance of the Mussulmans of Eastern Bengal, provided, of course, that the new Government of Bengal sees to it that the recommendations of the Education Commission of 1882 are carried out both in the spirit and the letter. For with facilities for education provided in the province, the Mussulmans can raise themselves to a position in which it will be impossible for anyone to deprive them of what is rightly their due. Some have no doubt asserted that the new University will perhaps compete with the great Moslem University at Aligarh. Nothing could be more absurd. For the great Moslem University is to be a central residential institution for the elite of the community, while the other is to help forward all those who might be left behind in the race of life by the supersession of Dacca by Calcutta. Competition between two such different institutions would be as absurd as a race between a bird and a fish. Calcutta and India as a whole will also gain educationally, for no university can be really efficient that has to cater for a population of over 100 millions and rush through more than 8,000 examination. It must necessarily become mechanical.

So resuming the facts, we can put the gains as a neutral and central capital, the satisfaction of the sentimental

mental grievance of the great Bengali nation, and the protection of the only real interest of the Moslems of Eastern Bengal. The loss comes to be limited to the loss of the social importance of Calcutta, but neither the loss of its trade nor of its prosperity.

Under these circumstances, I feel it my undoubted duty to advise my co-religionists to welcome the changes and be grateful to the Government that has initiated them. The need for this is all the greater since the Mussulmans will thus show their real and sincere sympathy with their Hindu brethren of Bengal and their readiness to respect Hindu and Bengali sentiment. Are not the feelings animating the promoters of the Hindu and Moslem Univerity schemes those of fraternal and healthy rivalry? And above all, by working for the success of these great changes loyally, wholeheartedly and without any *arriare pensees*, Moslems will best prove their loyal devotion to their gracious and beloved Sovereign, the King-Emperor, and their loyal appreciation of the sympathetic Government of Lord Hardinge that has removed the great sentimental grievance of the Bengalis and has yet protected, by promising a University at Dacca, all the real interests of the Moslems of Eastern Bengal.

INDIAN NATIONHOOD AND SELF-GOVERNMENT*

The report presented to-day justly points out that the young Moslems who come here from India in a steadily-increasing stream will help to form the life of India of the near future. From the point of view of influencing and guiding these young men, the work of such an organisation as this is of very great importance. I doubt whether public opinion here has any connection with the profound significance of the presence in London and in provincial educational centres of so many young men from India. It may be asked what are 300 or 400 young Moslems in comparison with 70 millions of Indian Mussulmans, or 1,600 or 1,700 Indians

*Speech delivered at the fifth annual general meeting of the London branch of All-India Moslem League on 14 July, 1913.

of various communities in comparison with the 315 millions of Hindustan. The answer is that they are like so many stones thrown into the middle of the placid pool or river each making concentric rings until the brink on either side is reached. Twenty years ago not only the mass of the people but men of standing of what is termed 'the old schools' looked askance at new-fangled ideas brought by the 'European returned' young men. But now they listen with almost greedy eagerness to any message brought from the West and ready to accept in an uncritical spirit the views of their young countrymen who have sojourned here. The day when the educated classes could be spoken of as a 'microscopic minority' has passed away : education is already diffused among the middle classes, and with the active encouragement and effort of Lord Hardinge's Government is filtering down to the people at large. The young men sojourning here are the leaders and fathers of the future ; though they are to be numbered only by hundreds they represent the hundreds of thousands of men of varying degrees of English education in India seeking to come more and more into touch with European thought and ideals ; and, beyond these hundreds of thousands, the millions who are learning to read newspapers and to interest themselves in the world outside their villages. The ideas and messages our youths take back with them from Europe are eagerly listened to, and it is of the greatest importance of India and the Empire that they should here imbibe right ideas and learn the right way of interpreting them. This consideration cannot be lost sight of in estimating the work o the London League, as the report points out and it is upon this ground that I use the opportunity, your committee has kindly provided me, to pass over mere current details and address myself to problems which go to the very roots of our national life.

Tribulations of Turkey

When I say that the work of guiding aright the future leaders of Indian Moslem thought is one of Imperial importance, I do not confine that word to India alone. The

recent Turkish war has demonstrated to the world the inherent solidarity of those who profess and call themselves Muslims. Wherever they may be, Mahommedans have a fellow-feeling and an interest in each other's welfare is inadequately realised in Europe where the strong religious sanctions of Islamic unity are not properly understood. In India in the last year or two the tribulations of Turkey and of Persia have absorbed the thought of the Moslem people to the practical exclusion of their own immediate affairs and those of India generally. The currents of feeling were very strong, and for a time our people were in danger of losing sight of certain fundamental considerations which they ordinarily hold with tenacity.

Whatever may have been the case in the past when affairs in Macedonia created irritation between England and Turkey, it is clear to thoughtful Indian Muslims that British and Turkish interests are closely identified. They feel that it is a matter of great moment to this country that Turkey should continue to hold sway as an independent power in Asia, and also that Persia should retain whatever remains of her integrity. Obviously the break-up of Ottoman dominion in Asia would expose the Western route to India to attack by other European powers. Mutual goodwill and good understanding between England and Turkey will afford the best possible safeguard against any partition of her Asiatic dominions. I have reason to believe that in view of all that has happened in recent years, Turkey is not merely willing but anxious to come more fully within the orbit of British influence. Whatever weight the Indian Moslems may possess in the Islamic world should be used for bringing Turkey and other Mahommedan countries into an attitude of genuine trust in Great Britain. They will thus be doing good service not only to the British Empire but also to their co-religionists in other countries ; they will help to fulfil the destiny which has ordained that the welfare of England and of the Islamic world should be closely interrelated, and that if one is weakened the other is weakened also.

Though appearances may sometimes be unpropitious, the British Empire, as was lately observed by the *Times*, is and

must be the bulwark of Islam. There are over 10,00,00,000 Muslims in the British Empire, a total compared with that of any other Power of Western Europe is small. Whatever is left of independent Mussulman States, in these circumstances they must either more or less gravitate under British influence or lose their position. Needless to say this aggregation of Moslems under the British Empire gives her a great moral asset in the beneficent and mighty part she plays in the world's affairs. At the same time it imposes great responsibilities upon the Indian Muslims, since they have a high destiny to fulfil in their capacity as by far the largest and most important section of the Mahommedan subjects of the Crown. The more steadfast and strong their loyalty is to the British Empire, the more influential they will naturally be in promoting that harmony of interests of which I have spoken and also in the moulding of British policy.

But these international considerations, though vital, should not lead to any neglect of the duties close at hand. In my judgment the Indian Moslems should in domestic affairs largely concentrate their efforts upon two great aims. The first of these should be to alter the position of affairs under which they are justly described in the recent Government pronouncement of Moslem education as 'educationally backward'. They cannot hope to play their part adequately and satisfactorily in the great developments of Indian life now in progress unless their educational equipment is equal to that of other communities. The second great aim should be to help in uplifting and reclaiming the depressed classes. The splendid example of which has been set in this respect by Christian missions, and in more recent years by Hindu agencies, have not been responded to by our people The Mussulmans are doing absolutely nothing to contribute to this essential element in the building up of Indian nationhood. It is high time that they set themselves to work both to elevate the depressed classes and to bring enlightenment and the advantages of cultured civilization to the wild tribes of the jungle and the hills.

Moslem League Platform

Having spoken of Indian nationhood, I may here refer to the adoption by the Committee of the Central League last winter of the ideal of self-government under the British Crown. That ideal, whether on Colonial lines as has been suggested by so many of our compatriots, or in some form 'suitable to India', the conditions of which we do not at present conceive and therefore do not attempt to define, must commend itself to thoughtful opinion, if it means, as I take it to mean, an ideal involving many decades of effort towards self-improvement, towards social reform, towards complete amity between various communities. Given personal and national self-sacrifice for generations to come, some form of self-government worthy of the British Empire and worthy of the people of India will be evolved, and Indians will have won a proud place for their nation in the world under the British Throne. But if it means a mere hasty impulse to jump at the apple when only the blossoming stage is over, then the day that witnessed the formulation of the ideal will be a very unfortunate one in our countries' annals. We have a long way to travel before the distant goal can be reached, and the voice of wisdom calls us to proceed step by step. The fact that the Central Committee confined itself to favouring some system 'suitable to India' shows that at present it is difficult even to define the plan which may be evolved as Indian life develops and expands. Such development, I need hardly say, must be social, material and moral as well as political if a goal worthy of the self-sacrifice involved and so India's place in the Empire is to be reached. We have the extraordinary example of the progress of Japan within living memory to show us that we cannot truly advance upon one side of our national life unless other sides are simultaneously developed. And the motive force must be religious, because for nothing else will vast masses of the East toil on for generations along the path of self-denial.

Mussulman's Opportunity

An element in the new national self-consciousness must be the mutual good-will and understanding of the different races of India. Unfortunately as the report observes, there are parts of the country where the relations of Hindus and Moslems are unsatisfactory. It is eminently desirable that in the provinces and districts where good-will and right-feeling exist missionaries should go forth to the less fortunate parts of the country in an effort to bring about good understanding. The Mussulmans have a great opportunity if they will only realise how far they can go in evoking and strengthening Hindu goodwill by voluntarily abandoning the public slaughter of cows for sacrifice. The question, as you are aware, is largely an economic one, and much could be done to solve it by committees of Mussulmans and rich Hindus organising subscriptions for the purchase of other animals to be sacrificed in substitution of kine. Good work could also be done by local committees for bringing Hindus and Mussulmans together in social intercourse. It is true that there are difficulties of caste in the way of taking both together, but no such obstacle stands in the way of games and sports. Years ago in Bombay, Lord Harris revealed to us how much can be done on the cricket field to create good feeling between different races. Play is instructive in young life in India as elsewhere : I believe that with due organisation there can be spread among our youths everywhere the commaraderie of the playing ground and that social knowledge and good-will is to be attained in India largely along the lines of the physical culture of our young people—a culture eminently desirable also for the direct benefits it will confer upon coming generations.

LETTER TO SYED WAZIR HASAN
(3 November, 1913)

I write you this letter to place in your hands as the Honorary Secretary of the All-India Moslem League my resignation which, allow me to assure you, is definite and irrevocable of the honour of being the President of the League.

Kindly communicate it to the Council and to the members in India.

It is my duty to tell you frankly most of the reasons that have decided me to take this step. I will begin by mentioning some of the minor and personal ones.

I am so circumstanced that I am compelled to be out of India for considerable periods every year (next year, for instance I have to spend six months in Africa and the year after I am compelled to go to South America for at least six months) and I have to be very often in Europe where I have considerable private interests, and where I am interested in some corporations. Thus, I cannot carry out the duties of President in the way I should like. In addition to this, I have other minor personal reasons of a purely domestic and family nature that make me consider it more advisable that I should retire from the presidency. However, all these personal reasons together would not have made me retire from the presidentship, if I thought that my continuance would serve the welfare of the community. But I have come to the conclusion, for reasons which I will now give you, that it is essential for our communal welfare that I should retire from the presidentship.

Both you and Mr. Mohamed Ali are well aware that I have had many personal reasons for wishing to take this course for some time past and I cannot further delay taking this step. But I do not propose to sever my connection with the League, far from it. Indeed I will continue to give my usual subscription and I am anxious to belong to its Council as an active member, and once I am relieved from the chair of President, I hope to attend every year the annual meeting. I sincerely believe that as an active member of the Council, free from the necessary 'judicial' character that attaches to the presidency, I can more effectively contribute my share to the service of the community.

In order to explain this clearly, I will have to go back to the history of the foundation of the League in India. When in the spring of 1906 I was at Aligarh, foreseeing the coming

political movement in India, I suggested to the late Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk the formation of a Federation or League in order to give our people a political platform and also to prevent their disappearance as a national entity and unity. In fact, I was anxious that the Mussulmans in India of the future should be a 'Kaum' or 'Millet' and not a mass of scattered units without political and social cohesion. He immediately agreed and the months that led to the formation of the deputation to the Viceroy he was occupied in preparing the ground. At that time, the Mussulman community in India owing to long neglect of all organized interest in politics had unfortunately fallen into a state of absolute chaos and political non-existence. In these early stages, the foundation of a League with a large number of office bearers from the aristocracy and men of strong social and financial position was absolutely necessary in order to give the organisation its weight and its status in the eyes of our Government and the Hindu community. The post of permanent president was necessary so that our organization in India might not die stillborn by too early struggles between different schools of thought in our community. Then came the long and memorable struggle to win the principle of separate representation on Councils, Imperial and Provincial. I, for one, never looked upon the principle of separate representation as a national policy, but as a necessity for awakening our people to the importance of political life and organization, in fact, partly to be an encouragement, but mainly to give them a platform and a sense of self-reliance. For me, separate representation in the Imperial and Provincial Councils was the only way for awakening our people from the state of coma into which they had fallen. I must say that in this early stage the League in India had as much need of high-sounding names for its office bearers as a newly formed company in the city has need of high-sounding titles on its board of directors.

Now, however, the League has reached the stage when it must depend for its prestige on the results of the services it renders to the community and on the popular backing and support that it receives rather than on the position or wealth

of its chief supporters. Happily the League has passed through its infancy. Thank God, I have lived and seen the beloved 'infant' reach the state of early manhood. I am profoundly convinced that in India a permanent president, an official spokesman and a recognized leader at this stage will hamper the natural evolution and development of our community, even if he be always on the spot and fully worthy of such a position. In future, the League in India must become more and more not a political party but a national organization of the loyal and devoted Moslem community in India, the organization in which all parties must be represented and all schools of thought given due voice. In future, the League cannot have a leader but leaders of parties representing different schools of thought, and each trying to convince the community that its policy is the best for India. I do not wish to give these parties question begging names by calling them conservative or liberal, moderate or extremist, re-actionary or progressive, for I consider all these names ill-suited as descriptions of parties that will have to deal with the practical problems of contemporary India.

I will give you two instances of questions on which there must be differences and discussions and I could early give you twenty similar examples and leave you to draw your own conclusions as to the probable lines of division of opinion in India. In these discussions and differences I, for one, mean to take part, free from the judicial character that attaches to the president, and, God willing, I may be the leader of those who agree with me from conviction.

One of the two instances is the question of separate representation on municipalities and local boards. There must necessarily be two or even three ways of dealing with this question and there must be two or three parties to a discussion that will ultimately settle our policy. The other example is the problem that must arise with regard to primary education and its relation to the local vernaculars and the Urdu language. As these questions arise, there must be differences and discussions before a settlement can be reached and I, for one, heartily

welcome the fact that our organization in India can now be, thanks to the awakening of our people, freed from the trammels of my presidentship. The future of our community in India and of the League depends on the peoples. This is a truism, but the time has come for our people to realise the truism and its responsibilities. They cannot leave the responsibilities to their officers and yet expect results that come only to active, patient and patriotic peoples. I am convinced that my retirement will help to develop this sense of responsibility and also that my varied experiences will be of greater service on the free bench of the League's Council than in the cramped chair of the President.

Nearly two years ago, for these very reasons, I tendered my resignation. Unfortunately, just before that time there had been a difference of opinion between me and large numbers in India on the question of the second partition of Bengal and the Durbar changes. The motive or my resignation was misunderstood and the community imagined that I was hurt at the criticisms passed on me and very graciously refused to accept my resignation, which was simply and solely for the reasons I have now told you and from a sense of duty. Then came the Turkish war and all its anxieties and sorrows. I could not go at such a time of pain and distress and our community's efforts had to be devoted to simple purpose or relieving the distress of the poor Moslems of the Balkans.

But now the time has come when the community must wake up and reorganise the League on a popular and sound basis, or it will degenerate into a self-appointed society of leaders without a following. If I continue any longer in the chair of the President, I shall not be doing my duty and my conscience compels me to take this step. If you or any other office-bearer of the League wishes to consult me on any matter, whether privately or publiclty, my advice is at your disposal.

With this explanation I place in your hands my resignation.

MUSLIM LEADERS' MANIFESTO*

(Calcutta, June 5, 1932)

It seems probable that within a comparatively short time hence His Majesty's Government will seriously undertake the task of propounding a settlement of the Indian communal problem. In doing so, the Government will naturally have to be influenced by many complex and important considerations, ranging over the whole vast field of Indian politics and sociology, not concentrating on only local detail or party interest at the cost of a true perspective of the Indian sub-continent.

For this reason we wish to make it clear at the outset that, despite inimical suggestions to the contrary, the well-known Muslim claims are not based solely on local or provincial prejudices or ambitions, but are inspired by the belief that their endorsement and constitutional ratification are essential to the peaceful security of the Muslim community's position in India. Were this not true, our claims regarding the community's right in the Punjab and Bengal, in the North-West Frontier Province and in Sind, would hardly have received the warm support given to them by Muslims in territories as remote therefrom as Madras and the Central Provinces. And we assert most emphatically that the ratification of our claims in the next constitution is necessary also to the peace and, therefore, the general welfare of India, since the neglect of such an opportunity to giving them effect both peaceably and permanently can only introduce an era of suspicion and internecine strife in India at the very time when those evils are most to be deplored.

We would even suggest that those who have honest doubts of the justices of our claims should consider whether their consciences would not suffer more from their bequest to India

---

*Text of a statement prepared by an influential group of Indian Muslims to the press of India and London. It was first published by the *Statesman* (Calcutta) on 5 June, 1932 and then by the *Times* (London) on 11 June, 1932 in a form amended by H.H. the Agha Khan.

of enduring communal bitterness and a strife than from the concession to 70,000,000 Muslims of a position a trifle stronger than that to which they may seem to be entitled by political logic.

That we ourselves cannot thus depreciate our claims must be obvious from a study of the distribution of India's peoples. Our claims particularly concern Bengal, the Punjab, Sind, the Frontier Province and Baluchistan.

In these Provinces the Muslims form the majority of the population, and in Sind, Baluchistan and the N.W.F. Provinces our majorities are great. But in Bengal and the Punjab there are very strong Hindu minorities. And though there is a considerable Muslim minority in the United Provinces, in all other parts of British India the Hindus are in a vast majority and inevitably enjoy complete political supremacy.

The vast majority of the Indian Princes, moreover, are Hindus, and in the Federal India the Princes will be able to influence All-India affairs to an extent now impossible.

We cannot, and will not, begrudge the Hindus such supremacy in places where they are plainly entitled to it and exercise it justly, if they in turn will concede the Muslims similar supremacy where the Muslims are entitled to it. But we must both begrudge and bitterly contest Hindu supremacy anywhere and everywhere in India in the interests of our community at large, if we are denied our rights where those rights are incontestable.

We could have allowed for claims to rest on these grounds along had not the Hindus counter-claimed that in all discussions of the rights of the various communities the Hindus' superiority of education, and wealth should be given marked consideration. It is news to us that popular constitutions are now-a-days based on considerations of accidental intellectuality and wealth and we hardly imagine that such arguments will prevail over the innate commonsene of the British public. But lest undue attention be paid to them anywhere we would set

against them certain facts of which the Muslims in India are justly proud.

(1) The number of Muslim soldiers serving in the Indian Army exceeds all proportion of the Muslim population of India. During the great War, the Indian Muslims made handsome response to the King-Emperor's call for troops, and their soldiers fought, under the gteatest hardships against co-religionists having affinities with them no less than against the German forces.

Englishmen have often said that in the War the Punjab was 'bled white', and the great majority of the Punjab troops were Muslims. So is the vast majority of the police, Militia and Frontier Constabularly who are charged with the protection of law and order in the North-West Frontier Province and of India's boundaries and Baluchistan, where they are constantly exposed to conflict with their kith and kin.

(2) The Muslims took little part in the Congress campaign of 1930, save in the North West Frontier Province where the "Red Shirts" were regrettably duped into accepting the Congress banner for a struggle begun independently of Congress and now ended in the triumph of justice over Congress intrigue. In the present Congress campaign, the Muslims have been openly hostile to the seditionists on more than one occasion, and fewer Muslims than ever before have been overtly sympathetic with their activities.

To claim special consideration on this ground alone might seem to be priggish ; but for our own part we assert that the Muslims' abstinence from Congress politics has been inspired not by hopes of gain thereform, for bitter experience gives us a contrary lesson chiefly because they have equally nothing to gain from the substitution of a Hindu Congress despotism for the present regime, and they recognize that Congress politics will only spell the economic ruin of India, Hindus and Muslims alike.

(3) Not one of the "political" murders or attempts of murder committed in any of the Governors' Provinces throughout the last two years or more has been done by a Muslim. The three murderers of Mr. Saunders and Channan Singh in Lahore were Hindus. The murderers of Mr. Lowman, Col. Simpson, Mr. Garlick, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Peddie and Mr. Doughlas were Hindus. So were the criminals who attempted the lives of the Governors of Bombay, the Punjab and Bengal, Mr. Villiers, Mr. Cassells and Sir Charles Tegart. All the suspects mentioned in connection with the attempt on Lord Irwin's Life, the murderer of Mr. Peddie and a host of similar crimes have been Hindus. The Chittagong Raiders and Khan Bahadur Ahsanullah's murderer were Hindus.

A study of political agitation and crimes even during the period 1907 to 1917, when Muslim feeling was more than once aroused against the Government, shows that the proportion of Muslims to Hindus notoriously involved was about 1 in 30. Nor can we recall that a single "Muslim newspaper" ever returned a word of sympathy for any of the political murderers of the last two years whereas the Hindu Congress Press for several months indulged in systematic glorification of even such criminal when he met his deserts.

We recapitulate these well-known facts for the reasons already given, and for one other. We believe that if the alternative to British rule were the ubiquitous supremacy of Hindu rule, the mass of our Muslim brethren would prefer the former not only because of the safeguard offered by its impartiality but also because under the alternative system there would be heinous strife between the virile and martial Muslim races and those many Hindus in whom the Congress Left-wing has sown the seed to insidious conspiracy and rebellion, blood-lust and lawlessness. But if the purpose of His Majesty's government is to give India federal responsibility with an equitable and just distribution of power and some guarantee of stability, if the determination of the various committees' political rights is a matter of great complexity and delicacy, as we know it to be,

and if the British people value the friendship of at least one fifth of the people of India, then we suggest that when the rival claims of the two great communities are weighed against one another, His Majesty's Government and the people should also weigh in the same scales the communities relative merits of loyalty and stability as proved by the facts of recent Indian history.

*The Amendment**

The Manifesto was sent to him recently with a request to arrange its publication in England in a form meeting with the Agha Khan's approval. He accordingly exercised his discretion in amending the text as published in England, but owing to a misunderstanding in the telegraphic messages the Manifesto was prematurely published in India before his views had been fully communicated. The only version for which the Agha Khan took responsibility was that published in the "Times" in which the strong attack against the Hindus had been eliminated. The Agha Khan emphatically disowned such sentiments while concurring with the Manifesto as a whole. The Agha Khan amended the offending message as follows :

It is well-known that Muslims have not participated in acts of political violence which have been so unhappily rife in Bengal, the Punjab and other Governors' provinces. The cult of revolutionary anarchy has never appealed to them successfully, nor has the Muslim Press joined the Hindu Congress Press in a systematic glorification of political murderers when they met with the penalty for their crimes.

*Reply of Nationalist Muslims and Jamiat***

A lengthy statement purporting to be signed by some members of the Muslim Conference and emanating from Simla

---

*Statement of the Agha Khan given in an interview to the Reuter in London.

**Issued by the members of the All-India Jamiat-ul-Ulema and some nationalist Muslims in New Delhi.

has recently appeared in the press. Another version of it, amended by His Highness the Agha Khan, appears to have been published in England. We have the former statement before us. The signatories have couched their own views in languages calculated to mislead those who are unacquainted with the realities of the Indian situation in India and abroad, into the false belief that these views are held by all the Musalmans of India. Had these worthies made it clear that they were ventilating their personal views and had they not exposed a majority of the Musalman community to humiliation, we would not have taken the trouble to take any serious notice of the utterances, particularly at a time when the country is passing through a crisis and the public mind is exercised by matters of moment, such as the poignant ordeal of tens of thousands, nearly eighty five thousands of whom, men and women, old and young, educated and uneducated are languishing in prisons. We have been constrained by the extraordinary claims made by these gentlemen to issue this statement to reveal the true state of affairs to save the Indian Musalmans from being lowered in the estimation of foreign nations and particularly the Musalmans of the world.

It is natural that at a time when far reaching changes are imminent, India like other countries of the world should have groups and parties professing political aims, situated as it is by followers of various creeds. But it is possible to classify the various schools of thought, now in existence in India, along political or communal lines in the following manner :

1. There are political groups among the Hindus, the Sikhs and the Muslims who lack confidence in their inherent strength and who hesitate to place any trust in the sense of justice and toleration in other communities. These groups are constantly engaged in putting forward their peculiar claims and do not hesitate to adopt unworthy methods of propaganda. They profess to be proud of ultra-loyal services to the British and without any sense of shame declare their willingness to remain permanently under British rule. They are past masters of vocal

and written propaganda and hope to reach their goal by these devices.

2. The second category, into which certain members of almost every community may be grouped has for its aim the change of the present system of government by argument, persuasion and negotiation. They certainly stand on a higher level and demand a constitution that may satisfy all communities and make Indians masters in their home. While the field of the practical achievement of this group remains strictly limited, it sympathises with movements for the freedom of the country even when they are launched by those with whom it may not be in agreement as regards the method and manner of their achievement. Followers of this creed are in no way less numerous among the Musalmans than among the Hindus and the Sikhs. It may, however, be noted that neither of the two above mentioned groups wield any appreciable influence among the masses.

3. The third school of thought in every community has the fullest confidence in the inherent powers of the people and their followers from the bulk of the population. It aims at attaining Self-Government at the earliest opportunity and its principles include the following :

(*a*) Interest of no class or community should be subordinated to the interests of any other and all should have the satisfaction of governing their country.

(*b*) Every community should have guarantees of protection of its political, religious, economic and cultural rights against every other community and should have assurance of freedom from domination by any community of country as well as from defence of any of them.

(*c*) The federal government should be fully responsible with freedom to determine India's relations with other countries, and the federating Provinces should be fully autonomous, the North-West Frontier Province being placed on the same footing as other Provinces.

(*d*) There should be a distribution of provinces on the principle of self-determination by people bound by ties of common language, culture and economic interests, such as the people of Sind, Orissa and other areas to which the above principle may apply.

(*e*) The cost of administration should be reduced to the minimum to suit the economic capacity of the country.

(*f*) The peasants and labourers should have their proportionate share in the government of the country.

The Indian National Congress also stands committed to these principles and counts amongst its adherent followers of this political creed among all communities whom for all intents and purposes it represents. Those who believe in non-violently resorting to direct action against the decision of an irremoveable executive have in their thousands courted sufferings, imprisonment in vindication of their rights and the number of Musalmans who have acted in this way has not been considerably disproportionate.

The Musalmans belonging to the last mentioned category claim that they have political distinction which is not shared by other communal groups placed in the same position. While a large enough number of them directly belonging to the Congress are consequently committed to the political creed of that body there are others, who while fully supporting the Indian National Congress have retained their distinct individuality. The All-India Jamiat Ulema represents the last mentioned section and constituted as it is by Muslim theologians, it commands the allegiance of by far the largest bulk of the Muslim population of India, as evidenced by the overwhelming response which it has evoked from Indian Musalmans from time to time and the latest demonstration of which was made on the 10th June throughout India. The Nationalist Muslims, the greatest majority of whom belong to the Congress, count among their adherents an influential section of Muslim intelligentsia. The Jamiat Ulema-i-Hind, although a distinct organization, has for its object the achievement of complete independence, which it

has practically pursued so far and which does not appear to have been the object of practical realization for any other distinctly communal organization in India. In the movement of 1930-31 a large number of the office-bearers and members of both the Jamiat Ulema-i-Hind and the Nationalist Muslim party suffered imprisonment and no less than fourteen thousand Musalmans went to jail, while some hundreds of them lost their lives. In the present movement also, thousands of Musalmans have gone to jail, including some four hundred Ulemas, and a very considerable number of Frontier Musalmans have lost their lives. It is claimed, not without justification, that the bulk of those Musalmans who have participated in the present movement have done so in response to the call of the Jamait Ulema-i-Hind in support of the Congress movement.

This represents as close an analysis of the situation as is consistent with facts and it is hoped that it will help people in India and abroad to form a more just view of the outlook of Indian Musalmans. We are under no circumstances apprehensive of aggressiveness on the part of any community under the constitution which we have outlined. In fact, we are convinced that justice would be easier of achievement under the new system and it would not be as hard as it is today to fight successfully against any injustice.

There now remains to be described but only one other type of men whose desperation, excessive zeal, and a partiality for Western revolutionary methods have led them to acts of violence. But we are aware of no party, political or otherwise, in the country that has not done every thing in its power to discourage it. The pulpit and the platform have been extensively availed of in pursuit of restraining influences, and under these circumstances it is nothing short of the deliberate audacity to saddle the Congress with even the faintest sympathy with or toleration of crimes of violence. Before concluding we may also observe that it would be an insult to tens of thousands of Frontier Musalmans to suggest that their participation in the

present movement has been the result of any external influences and not of their deliberate decision.

One of the fruitful causes of mutual recrimination has been the failure to evolve a resolution of the communal problem. But we take this opportunity of informing those who are unaware of the fact that the Jamait-i-Hind, the Muslim Nationalists and the Indian National Congress had evolved certain formulas which, if pooled together, would have secured the greatest measure of agreement between various parties, but before that object could be achieved. Mahatma Gandhi had suddenly to go to the Round-Table Conference and immediately after his return, he and other leaders of public opinion found themselves behind prison bars and the offensive which was launched against Congress organizations is still in progress. India has so far awaited the much talked of award by the British Government and we wonder if and when it comes, it is likely to satisfy any one.

Finally, we earnestly assure all the communities in India and the people abroad that Indian Musalmans as a community are next to none in their love of freedom or the will to live peacefully and harmoniously and to stand shoulder to shoulder with other fellow Indians in the task of leading the country to its highest destiny. Self-respect, self-reliance and faith in the progress of humanity are among the articles of their faith and they are convinced that they would serve Islam more faithfully by strict adherence to these principles.

2

NAWAB MOHSIN-UL-MULK

[Widely known as Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk, Syed Mehdi Ali (1837-1907) had the peculiar distinction of being a scholar of Arabic and Persian and a very capable and honest administrator under the control of A.O. Hume, the Collector of Etawah and later the founder of the Indian National Congress. His rise occurred due to the patronage of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan at whose instance he left the government service so as to serve the Hyderabad State of the Nizam who conferred upon him the titles of Munir Nawaz Jung and Nawab Mohsin-ud-Daula Mohsin-ul-Mulk. After retiring from the State service of Hyderabad in 1893, he shifted to Aligarh and became the leading figure of the Aligarh Movement. In 1893 and 1896 he presided over the annual session of the Mohammedan Educational Conference. On 18 August, 1900 he addressed the session of the Indian Defence Association held at Lucknow. On this occasion he said : "Though we donot wield the power and our pen is not powerful which is why we are seldom seen in offices, yet we have the strength to wield the sword and our hearts are full of love for the Queen." In the controversy relating to the character of the Indian National Congress between Justice Badruddin Tyabji and Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, he took cudgels on behalf of the latter and sought to convert the mind of the former. As Secretary of the Managing Body of the Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College, Aligarh, he fought for the minority character of the institution. Through the English Principal of this College (Archbold) he could establish contact with Dunlop Smith (Private Secretary to the Viceroy) that paved the way for the meeting of the Muslim Deputation with Lord Minto at Simla on 1 October, 1906. In 1907 the Nawab of Dacca (Salimullah Khan) requested him to write

the constitution of the Muslim League with the help of Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk. He died on 16 October, 1907 in the words of Maulana Hali, like 'a friend of the Muslims, the people's benefactor, winner of the battle for freedom and departing like a martyr'.]

LETTER TO THE EDITOR, PIONEER*

It might perhaps be thought I was entering into the above controversy somewhat late in the day, but I have advisedly preserved silence so as not to interfere in any way with a full and free ventilation of the diverse opinions, which I knew a subject so delicate, was susceptible of. And even now I would have preferred to keep silent, but that my old friend Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk has made repeated appeals to me to let the public know how far Mr. Nundy was correct in quoting me as an advocate of the Mahommedans throwing in their lot with the Congress, and that my silence was misconstrued into an acquiescence of the views expressed by him. Mr. Nundy has, no doubt by reading one or two detached sentences of a speech of mine which was not fully reported, been driven to draw inferences which are not quite warranted, I shall claim your indulgence to be allowed a little space to make my position clear. I may at the outset state that I have not identified myself with the Congress in any way. I still adhere to the views to which I gave expression in the *London Times* and the *St. James Gazettee* some twelve years ago, which are as follows : (1) India is prospering under British rule. (2) It is bad policy on our part to create unnecessary difficulties in the way of Government by stirring up popular agitation, that we must have a certain amount of confidence in the Government on whose shoulders lies the great responsibility of governing a heterogeneous people like the population of India. (3) Any attempt to transplant the political institutions which have grown up in England, to India, where the social institutions (which are in every country the basis of all political institutions) are widely different, is pretty sure to prove a failure. (4) The leaders of the Congress

*Letter from Fateh Nawaz Jung (Mehdi Hasan), having important references to the views of Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk, dated 14 April, 1901.

command the respect as much of the Mahommedans as of the Hindus and whilst their loyalty is undoubted, intellectually they occupy the first ranks in Indian society. But along with this there are certain other opinions I hold which go to constitute my articles of faith as regards political matters. I hold that secret agitation of any kind is injurious both to the rulers and the ruled. The so-called discontent and want of sympathy between the Government and the people, the existence of which is inferred from the criticisms to which officials are subjected, is not due so much to the administrative errors of Government, which is actuated by the best of motives, as to the attitude of exclusiveness, assuming the appearance of pride (a thing most repugnant to the feelings and sentiments of Orientals) of individual members of the ruling class. The question of race estrangement, however trifling it may appear to be nonchalant or satirical, is of the first importance in India. Indeed I am convinced that the future success of British rule in India depends on the successful solution of this problem. No community can prosper if it sits with folded hands trusting the Government to satisfy its needs, but ready to reproach it for not having learnt by inspiration what was likely to promote its welfare. Having regard to these principles which I take as my guide there was nothing inconsistent in my inviting the leaders of the Congress for whom everyone of us has the greatest possible respect to a banquet as stated by Mr. Nundy, nor was there anything inconsistent in my taking part in the Urdu defence agitation. It was to propagate the above principles that in a speech delivered on an occasion when the Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk was present and when he had advocated the sinking of minor differences between Hindus and Mahommedans and their meeting to promote their common welfare, that I declared that the time had arrived when the members of my community must throw off their lethargy and let the Government in a calm, loyal and dispassionate manner know their wants and grievances, and even take into their consideration whether it was not possible to arrive at an understanding with the members of other communities so far as joint action in

political matters was concerned. I have no desire to repudiate anything that was stated by me then, for not only do I feel the necessity of seriously considering how we can maintain our position on the political stage of the English Empire, but I feel assured that a large number of educated and thoughtful Mahommedans cordially agree with my sentiments. The articles contributed by my friend Mr. Nundy to the Pioneer gave rise to a lengthy controversy, but it is a somewhat significant fact that the controversy on behalf of the Mahommedans was carried on by two individuals only, Nawab Imad-ul-Mulk and Mohsin-ul-Mulk. The Nawab Imad-ul-Mulk is an old and honoured friend of mine who by reason of his high position and scholarly attainment deservedly occupies a leading position in our community. Any expression of opinion by him on any matter relating to our community would undoubtedly command respect. In his Presidential address at the Mahommedan Conference at Rampur he briefly stated his views as regards political agitation in these terms : 'I quite admit that in these modern days of enlightenment the people are entitled to criticise the acts of their Government and have some voice in the management of their own affairs', but when a few days later Mr. Nundy claimed this pronouncement as confirming his views as to the change of attitude amongst the Mahommedans, the Nawab wrote in your columns a letter which was read by a large number of his friends and admirers in his own community with mingled feelings of shame and indignation. It is the aim of the British Government and of all well-disposed persons that the various communities, should cultivate feelings of toleration and harmony towards each other ; and this can hardly be realised when the leaders of one community take to telling the leaders of another community that they are rebels and traitors and deserve to be hanged without in any way taking the trouble to specify why they deserve this fate. A letter so illogical, uncharitable and abusive carries its own condemnation, but unfortunately it has done or is likely to do us a deal of harm. For whereas it has subjected our community to adverse criticism for holding such irrational and ferocious views, it cannot tend to improve our relations with the Government. From a long

and somewhat intimate acquaintance with Englishmen I have come to the conclusion that there is nothing they dislike more than flattery and servility whilst they are prepared to admire honesty and independence though wrong-headed. I am afraid that the Nawab's contributions on this head will not tend to raise our national character in public estimation. His allegation that 'we have made it our business to teach our political creed at Aligarh so that the rising generations should grow up in doctrines which we deem to be sounder and much more patriotic than the doctrines taught by the Congress is so grandly vague that I am surprised that my good friend the Nawab did not see that he was laying himself open to the charge of indulging in clap-trap. Besides as a Trustee of the Aligarh College I have no hesitation in stating that politics in any shape is a strictly forbidden subject there. The Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk's contribution to this controversy is mainly distinguished for his declaration that it was the policy of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan never to engage in political agitation and that this policy is being rigidly carried out at the present time by his successors. I beg to join issue with my friend there. It was not the policy of our late respected leader never to engage in an open discussion of our wants and grievances. The principle he laid down for his guidance was briefly this, in the first place freely and frankly to lay his views on any particular matter before the head of the local government and to try his utmost to bring that official to accept those views and concede to him the desired boon or remove any disability complained of. Failing this I assert with the utmost confidence that no one resorted more readily to public education than did the late Sir Syed Ahmed. And here there are two considerations that we must not lose sight of. There is now no one amongst us who commands the respect and enjoys the confidence of the Government as well as that of our community as did our late leader, with the result that the first and, I admit, our best mode of approaching Government is lost to us. Then again it is an undoubted fact that there has been a change in the manner in which the Congress propaganda was carried on 10 to 12 years ago, much that was objectionable in the speeches and in the

reforms advocated having been carefully eliminated. Under these circumstances in the absence of a responsible leader amongst us, I hold that a public discussion of grievances carried out in a temperate and constitutional manner is of necessity forced upon us if we are desirous of preserving ourselves as a nation and not becoming hewers of wood and drawers of water. And if a public agitation for the preservation of our rights has been forced upon us, I take it that the time has arrived when the thoughtful and educated members of our community must take into their serious consideration whether they gain anything by living in alienation from the other communities who are making rapid strides, not only materially but in the cultivation of those higher and more manly qualities which at any rate remove from them the reproach of obsequiousness and sycophancy. That great scholar Shamsul Oolamah Syed Ali Bilgrami, Public Works Secretary of the Nizam's Government (and a brother of Nawab Imad-ul-Mulk) a few weeks ago openly declared that he 'deprecated strongly the idea of complete isolation from our Hindu brothers in movements involving national progress.' Similarly I, as one interested in the welfare of my community, threw out a hint in the speech referred to by Mr. Nundy whether the time had not arrived to consider how far it was possible to arrange a compromise with the leaders of the National Congress, so that it may be practical for the Mahommedans to take part in it, and I am prepared to stand by my declaration. At the same time I must take exception to the remark of Mr. Nundy imputing ulterior motives to the late Sir Syed Ahmed for his abstention from joining the Congress and to his somewhat sweeping assertion that the Mahommedans, aggrieved at certain acts of Government had decided on throwing in their lot with the National Congress. Whatever they may do in the future it would be unsafe to predict, but this much I will admit that the policy of isolation hitherto adopted is gradually losing its advocates and a change of some kind seems both imminent and desirable.

ON SYED AHMED KHAN'S POLITICAL ATTITUDE

Though Sir Syed Ahmed Khan held the view that the Muslims' greatest need was higher education and they should

make all possible efforts to acquire it, yet he was not oblivious of the fact that Muslims as a nation had some special needs which in most respects were different from and in some respects contrary to those of other nations of this country; also the Muslims on account of their inadequate education and unfamiliarity with English literature and English political principles were less capable of protecting their rights and objects, and it is, therefore, necessary to devise some special method for the defence of their rights and national aims. He, therefore, pondered deeply on this question and also consulted such persons, as were competent to express opinion on this delicate problem. Ultimately he proposed on December 30, 1893 that a Committee be formed for the defence of the political rights of the Muslims.'

ON KHALIFA AND KHILAFAT

Khalifa and Khilafat are both very misleading words. The appellations used for the Sultan of Turkey *viz.* Ameer-ul-momineen (Chief of the faithful) and Khalifat-ul-Muslimeen (the Caliph of the Muslims) have produced a great many misconceptions in the minds of Europeans at the present day. It seems necessary therefore that, following the example of Sir Syed who wrote an excellent article at the time of the Greco-Turkish War, we should on this occasion explain the question clearly and set forth the meaning of it.

We will not discuss the word Khalifa, nor need we enter into the question whether in our day it is right to call any king a Khalifa. But we take the words Sultan and Khalifa as synonyms denoting nothing more than a kingship.

The Mahommedans who call the Sultan of Turkey a Khalifa may be divided into two classes—those over whom the Sultan rules; and those over whom the Sultan does not rule. Now if the Turks and other subjects of the Sultan, call him a Khalifa in the sense that they owe him obedience in all matters, they are possibly justified. But the Mahommedans, we in India, and others who are not under the Turkish rule, and over whom the

Sultan cannot exercise any authority, and who are not bound in any way to obey him, if we call the Sultan a Khalifa, we do so merely to show our respect for the greatest Mussulman king whose position is rendered still more important by his being the servant of the sacred Harems, the Ca'aba. It should on no account be understood to mean that we regard him as our ruler in any way and consider his orders binding upon us. We use the word Khalifa merely as a title of honour, and it does not follow that because we do so we are ever likely to oppose the Government under which we actually live. In times past also, when the Caliphate was divided into three parts and the Abbassides, Fattimites and the Umaiyyads ruled over Baghdad, Egypt and Spain respectively, each of the rulers of the three dynasties was called a Khalifa in the sense that he exercised the powers and prerogatives of a Khalifa within his own territorial jurisdiction. But in spite of the fact that they were all called Khalifas, no man in Baghdad could say that as regards the authority vested in a Khalifa, the ruler of Baghdad was the Khalifa of Spain or Egypt : nor was the Khalifa of Spain or Egypt acknowledged as being the Khalifa of Baghdad in that country.

If Mahommedans and Europeans know the religious views held by the Mahommedan Jurists and Doctors with regard to the use and application of the word Khalifa and the duties and rights pertaining to that office, there would be no room for any misconception.

The late Maulana Shah Wali-ullah defines Khilafat thus :--

'It denotes a form of popular Government the object of which is to establish religion by reviving learning; by preserving the articles of faith ; by setting up Jehad with all the incidents connected therewith such as the maintenance of armies and military accountrements ; by spreading justice ; by punishing offenders ; by ordering virtuous conduct and forbidding vice ; and by doing all acts in the capacity of a viceroy of the holy Prophet.'

The brief and concise definition of Khilafat and the duties and prerogatives pertaining to the office of Khalifa, is explained in all the theological works on the subject. In *Ahkam-us-Sultania,* which is a standard work it is written thus : In general matters, there are ten duties binding on a Khalifa :

1. The protection and defence of religion in accordance with all those principles which have been established and upon which all the ancient holy men are agreed. For instance if any Mahommedan introduces any new thing into religion, or swerves from the right path by reason of any doubt arising in his mind, it would be the duty of the Khalifa to satisfy him with proper arguments and show him the truth. He is entitled to use all the lawful means in his power necessary to keep religion safe and free from all dangers and decay.

2. To do justice between man and man, by passing impartial judgment after hearing the points of dispute. It is the duty of the Khalifa to spread justice in the country so that the weak might not suffer at the hands of those that are strong.

3. To preserve peace and quiet in the country, so that people may engage in their work with safety, and may travel at will for their benefit.

4. To punish offenders according to law in order that the respect for Divine authority may be maintained, and no wrong be done to anybody.

5. To strengthen the boundaries of the Kingdom by the maintenance of military forces, so that no invaders may dare to effect entrance into the country and shed the blood of Muslims and Zimees.

6. To make war with those who after having been duly invited to accept the faith, persist in their old beliefs, until they either become converts or Zimees.

7. To realize Khiraj (money levied on smaller kingdoms as protection money) and charitable funds which religion has prescribed.

8. To take care of the Public funds and to control the expenditure with wisdom, being neither extravagant nor too sparing.

9. To appoint able and well-intentioned men to the high offices of the state in order that all work may be conducted in a way that is proper.

10. To exercise personal supervision in all matters so that religion may be safe and the progress of the country may be ensured. It is not fit to give the work to be done by others while the Khalifa himself either devotes himself to religious practices or worldly pleasures. For at times those upon whom trust is placed prove false and even well wishers are known to deceive. God says in the Koran 'O David I have made thee Khalifa in the world, therefore do thou justice among men and do not follow thy fancies for thou shalt stray from the way of God.' In this extract God has not only enjoined upon the Khalifa to do justice himself but he is also declared inexcusable and lost if he follows his 'own fancies in anything.'

11. In view of the duties and rights enumerated and explained above it is impossible for any man of even very common understanding, to think that the Sultan of Turkey is the Khalifa of the Indian Mussulmans or that the Mahommedans of India can call him their Khalifa in the real sense of the term. Evidently, the Sultan cannot exercise any of the powers and prerogatives of the Khalifa over the Mahommedans of this country nor are they in any matter bound by their religion to obey the Sultan. They are subjects of the King Emperor and owe their allegiance to him alone. The commands of the King Emperor are religiously binding upon them and I think there is hardly any

single Mahommedan who thinks or wants to act as though it were otherwise. It is therefore quite wrong to discuss the question of the Khalifat in the senses explained above and to call the Sultan Khalifa with the meaning which the word conveys.

But by denying Khilafat it does not follow that the Indian Mussulmans have no love for the Sultan of Turkey and that they do not care for the safety of the Turkish Government. On the contrary, the truth is that all the Mahommedans have great sympathy and love for the Sultan. They all wish with one heart the stability of the Turkish rule and earnestly pray to God that friendly relations between their Government *i.e.* the British Government and the Sultan may be firmly established. Those of us who say that they do not care a bit for the Sultan and for Turkey, are either flatterers of the British Government whom it is certain, the Government will never believe, or they have no love for religion ; they also go against the natural law.

It should be remembered that sympathy for religion and for a community is quite distinct from political relations. It is not necessary that those who love the Sultan because he is of the same religion should not also be loyal and faithful to the British Government under which they live. Nor does it follow because we are subjects of the British Government that therefore we should not wish for the safety of the Sultan or other Mussulman Rulers and be sorry for them if anything happens to them. Loyalty towards our Government does not exclude the idea of sympathy with one's co-religionists. Those who think that the two are exclusive of each other, are ignorant both of their religious duties and of their political relations. There are many things in this world in which as a matter of duty one has to do acts for which by natural sentiment one feels sorry. For instance if any one of us is made a judge and his own son or father is charged before him he would as an impartial judge, if the case is proved, pass sentence upon him although he would feel extremely sorry to do so.

Thus also, if God forbid, there be a war between our Government and any Mahommedan power, we should, as loyal subjects, be on the side of our own Government, but as Mahommedans we should also be sad about it.

And we think that no true Mahommedan in India holds a different opinion.

LETTER TO DUNLOP SMITH
(7 October, 1906)

The members of the Committee appointed to consider what improvements may be effected in the constitution of the Legislative Councils, with especial reference to the strength and position therein of the non-official Members, were so good as to give me an opportunity of discussing with them the question of Mahommedan representation on those bodies, and I beg to state my views on the subject for submission to His Excellency's Government.

Both on the Supreme and the Provincial Councils an adequate number of seats should be reserved exclusively for the Mahommedans. The present system of election applicable to the general body of the people need not be interferred with, and it should remain open, as hitherto, to all communities. For the seats on the Legislative Chambers reserved for the Mahommedan community separate electorates should be created, and the franchise in their case may be distributed on the following basis :

A—For the Provincial Councils

(1) Every Mahommedan British Indian subject paying income-tax on an income of Rs. 1,000 a year.

(2) Every Mahommedan landowner having a net rent roll of Rs. 1,000 a year, to be ascertained on the basis of Revenue assessments as obtaining in different Presidencies and Provinces.

(3) Every Mahommedan member of the Senate of a University.

(4) Every Mahommedan graduate of five years standing, shall each have a vote, but no single individual should have more than one vote, though he may happen to combine several qualifications. With reference to (1) and (2), the standard might be adapted to the circumstances of each Province.

Each Presidency of Province should, where local conditions require it, be divided into two or more electoral divisions or constituencies in accordance with its particular needs and circumstances. Every one of these constituencies or a combination of them will be entitled to return a Member at each election, or by turns, as may be determined in view of the number of seats reserved on the particular Provincial Council. For instance, West Bengal ought to be divided into Bihar, and rest of West Bengal, the United Provinces into Oudh, and the rest of that Province, and so forth. This, I think, is necessary in order to safeguard against an unequal distribution of the privilege. In this connection, it may also well be considered whether important cities like Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Lahore, Lucknow, Allahabad, Aligarh, Patna, and Dacca should not be given separate franchise so far as their Mahommedan citizens are concerned In every electoral division or constituency, each district should form a unit, but the number of votes which a particular district should be entitled to ought to be proportionate to the number of votes it may contain.

B—The Supreme Council

The Muhommedan Members of different Provincial Councils, and the Mahommedan Fellows of the Indian Universities, and Mahommedans having an annual income, say, of Rs. 25,000 a year should be given the right to elect men out of their own body, or outside it, for the seats reserved on the Supreme Council. But in order to make sure that the interests of the Mahommedans of any particular Province may not be overlooked, it will in my opinion be necessary to lay down that the choice of the electors should be confined in terms to the

Mahommedan inhabitants of a particular Province or Provinces.

With regard to the registration of voters and the method by which votes ought to be recorded, or poll taken, these are matters of detail which I need not enter into.

The above outline of my views is neither full nor final and it is possible that, on further reflection, I may be in a position to make suggestions in addition to, or in modification of them.

REPLY FROM DUNLOP SMITH TO NAWAB MOHSIN-UL-MULK

(12 October, 1906)

I submitted your letter of the 7th to the Viceroy, in which you sketch various improvements proposed to be effected in the constitution of the Legislative Councils. I am to thank you for this frank expression of the views of your Committee, and to inform you that a copy of your letter has been sent to the Committee of the Executive Council now sitting for their consideration.

The Viceroy will be glad to receive any further communication which you may find it possible to make on this subject later on.

3

NAWAB VIQAR-UL-MULK

[Widely known as Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk, Maulvi Mushtaq Husain (1841-1917) is another leading figure of the Aligarh Movement who fulfilled the mission of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. Like Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk, he served the State of Hyderabad and got the title of Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk from the Nizam for his great services. But he resigned the service of the Nizam in 1892 and made Aligarh his home town. Like Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and his ardent followers, he realised that if the Muslims were to occupy a dignified and responsible position in the political life of the country, they should not only spread education among their co-religionists, but also organise themselves politically. So he appreciated the formation of the Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association by Sir Syed Ahmed Khan in 1893 to protect the legitimate political rights of the Muslims. He was a member of the deputation led by His Highness the Agha Khan that waited on the Viceroy Lord Minto at Simla on 1 October, 1906. He played the role of a founder member of the Muslim League and delivered inaugural address at its session held at Dacca under the chairmanship of Nawab Salimullah Khan and drafted its constitution with Nawab-Mohsin-ul-Mulk. After the death of Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk in 1907, he became the Secretary of the Board of Trustees of the Muhammed an Anglo-Oriental College of Aligarh. He asserted his authority and so picked up a dispute with its English Principal (Archbold) who submitted his resignation in protest. But the matter could be sorted out by the Trustees when they defined the powers of the Secretary and of the Principal in clear terms and instructed the Principal to consult the Secretary before sending any communication to the Government. He faithfully adhered to the line of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan that the Indian

National Congress was a Hindu organisation and that in any scheme of constitutional reforms granting self-government to India, there should be some form of reservation of seats for the the Muslims in view of their numerically weaker position. It is evident from his advocacy for the cause of separate electorates for the Muslims the demand for which was contained in the Simla Memorandum and that saw its fulfilment in the Indian Councils Act of 1909.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR*

Sir,

I have read the Pioneer of 31 July last the telegraphic communication purporting to give a summary of the proceedings of meeting held at Saharanpur in connection with a proposed Mohammedan Political Association. While giving a fairly correct account of the proceedings, your correspondent has reported them in a manner which renders the aims and objects of the Association liable to be misunderstood. Now to call the movement a Musalman Congress' as your correspondent has done, is apt to give it a character different from what it is intended to have. I have no objection to the word Congress being applied to this Association, if your correspondent or any one else chooses to do so ; but I do object to the implied suggestion which tends to establish a correspondence between our movement and the Indian National Congress. The two movements are essentially different not only in their most important objects, but also in their *modus operandi*. Public agitation, such as has a tendency to lead the public mistrust in the Government, is the distinctive feature of the National Congress ; whereas our programme expressly avoids public agitation and accepts as an axiom a complete confidence in the Government. We start with the firm conviction and seek to implant it in the mind of every Indian Mussulman, that our national destiny is

*Letter written by Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk to the Editor, *Pioneer* regard ng the Mohammedan Political Association which appeared in its issue of 16 August, 1903.

now bound up with the presence and permanence of British rule in this country, and that in the Government of the day we have got our best and surest friend. But the Government is confronted with such difficult and complex problems, and it has to deal with such various and conflicting interests, that it does require help on the part of the governed in the shape of true representation of facts and free expression of their wants. We, the Indian Mussulmans, being in the minority, have our own especial needs and require some means through which we can place them before the Government. Sir Syed performed the important function on behalf of our community. In all the matters connected with the Government he had come to be regarded by a sort of tacit consent as the representative of the whole community, and the Government always recognised him as such. He always voiced their wants and sentiments with complete freedom, and his representations always received due considerations at the hands of the Government. But in later years even Sir Syed felt the need of an organised body for the purpose of representing our interests to the Government. In 1893 he started the Defence Association with the object of defending Mussulman interests as opposed to the other conflicting interests to the country. Upon Sir Syed's death his place as leader and representative of the community in matters political remained unfilled and is so to the present day ; and the result was that when the time came, soon after his death, for a proper representation of our views and sentiments with regard to the Urdu and Hindi question, there was confusion and chaos. The Government professed to recognise certain gentlemen as representatives whom the community regarded as mere *je-huzoors*, and the men who professed to represent the views of the community were branded by the Government as mere upstarts and nobodys. There was no one individual or body of individuals entitled to be regarded as the representative of the community, and this pitiable situation suggested the idea of reviving the old organisation which Sir Syed had initiated, with certain modifications required by the changed circumstances and conditions of our time. Such ideas had been agitating the minds of the thinking portion of the community for a long time

Government directly, putting our case with respect and moderation. This is what our Association proposes to do. I hope I have made our position clear ; and as the report published in paper seems to convey something different and puts a different complexion upon the character of our movement, I thought it necessary to address you these lines in the hope that you would give them some space in your paper.

THE DACCA ADDRESS*

I have no words with which to thank you for the honour you have done me in electing me as your Chairman to-day. The place could have well been filled by many others in the community who are present here, but now that you have commanded me to fill it, I can only obey your wishes and discharge the duties of a Chairman of such an assembly to the best of my powers. I have, however, to thank the Hon'ble Nawab Salim-ul-lah Khan Bahadur of Dacca specially, for the title which he has unconsciously given to me. I have my doubts about being Viqar-ul-Mulk or 'the pride of the country', but I can assure you I am, as I have always been, 'Mushtaq-ul-Mulk' or 'the lover of my country.' To us old men creeping every day nearer to our graves, what is left to do, but to be Mushtaq-ul-Mulk and Mushtaq-ul-Qaum, lovers of our country and lovers of our race.[1] I feel that the unwitting recognition of my love of my people, for which I have to thank my Hon'ble friend the Nawab Bahadur of Dacca, is my greatest claim to fill the chair you are now offering me. May I long deserve this title.

I believe you all know what you have come to discuss. As this deliberation on political questions will be a free one, I trust no person who is a Government servant will take part in it, as the tie which binds him to the Government precludes the possi-

---

*Inaugural address delivered (in Urdu) at the session of Muslim League held at Dacca on 30 December, 1906

1. The term 'race' is here and hereafter used in the sense of '*millat*', not in the racial or ethnic sense and some Arabic terms are also translated as 'people', 'nation' or 'community'.

bility of our regarding him free in the sense in which non-official members of any community can be. Moreover, the discussion of such grave problems requires maturity and experience on the part of us all, so that young men who are still in school and college cannot be expected to offer to us a fair share of either. At the present stage of their lives they should learn and not teach. They should therefore not be encouraged to leave the hard task of mastering things for the more pleasant one perhaps, of dictating to others. When they have graduated and stepped into the arena of the world, we shall welcome their participation, but not yet. So, if there is any gentleman present here who is a Government servant, he should withdraw, and if he is a student in a college or school, I shall request him not to come forward to participate actually in this discussion.

Gentlemen, that which has drawn us here to-day is not a need which has only now been felt by us. When the National Congress was founded in India, this need had even then been felt, and the late Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, to whose foresight and statesmanship Musalmans should always be grateful, had made great endeavours to impress upon Musalmans the belief that their safety and prosperity lay in their keeping aloof from the Congress. This view has been proved to be so far right that though Sir Syed Ahmed Khan is no more among us, the Mohammedans are still firm in that belief, and as time passes they will feel more and more that, in order to protect and advance their political rights and interests, it will be necessary for them to form their own separate organization. Five years ago, in October 1901, some Musalmans from various provinces had assembled at Lucknow, and, after careful consideration of the matter, they had come to the conclusion that the time for the formation of such an organization had come, and consequently the work of organizing such a body in the United Provinces was going on when new events followed close upon each other in Bengal ; and impressed by the commotion caused by the direct and indirect influence of the National Congress, and finding that the Government intended to increase the

representative element in its Legislative Councils, Musalmans, as a community, sent a Deputation to the Viceroy to Simla last October, and represented their needs, and the disadvantages under which their community had been labouring, before His Excellency. All these proceedings, together with the Viceroy's reply to the Deputation, have already been fully reported in the press and made familiar to the country. I need not allude to them in detail now. On that occasion, those representatives of the community who had assembled as members of the Deputation had, after a careful consideration of the ways and means by which the political rights and interests of their co-religionists could be permanently safeguarded, decided that in December next, delegates from different provinces should be asked to assemble at Dacca and discuss this momentous question. In the meantime, the Nawab Bahadur of Dacca had framed a scheme for the same purpose and circulated it for the consideration. To-day we have assembled here to settle finally the lines of action in a question the settlement of which has so long been postponed.

Before I proceed with the work we have in hand to-day, I fell it necessary to say that, no matter what the general principles of British administration may be, and no matter what rights may be vouchsafed by the generosity and love of justice of the British nation to its Indian subjects, we who have not yet forgotten the tradition of our own recent rule in India and elsewhere, and are more intimately acquainted than other communities of India with the proper relations which should subsist between the Government and its subjects, should accept it as a rule of our conduct that the plant of the political rights of a subject race thrives best in the soil of loyalty, and consequently the Musalmans should prove themselves loyal to their Government before they can ask for a recognition of any of their rights. The Musalmans are only a fifth in number as compared with the total population of the country, and it is manifest that if at any remote period the British Government ceases to exist in India, then the rule of India would pass into the hands of that community which is nearly four times as

large as ourselves. Now, gentlemen, let each of you consider what will be your condition if such a situation is created in India. Then, our life, our property, our honour, and our faith will all be in great danger. When even now that a powerful British administration is protecting its subjects, we the Musalmans have to face most serious difficulties in safeguarding our interests from the grasping hands of our neighbours, instances of which are not rare in any province or district, then woe betide the time when we become the subjects of our neighbours, and answer to them for the sins, real or imaginary, of Aurangzeb, who lived and died two centuries ago, and other Musalman conquerors and rulers who went before him. And to prevent the realization of such aspirations on the part of our neighbours, the Musalmans cannot find better and surer means than to congregate under the banner of Great Britain, and to devote their lives and property in its protection. I must confess, gentlemen, that we shall not be loyal to this Government for any unselfish reasons ; but that it is through regard for our own lives and property, our own honour and religion, that we are impelled to be faithful to the Government ; and consequently the best security for our good faith is the undoubted fact that our own prosperity is bound up with, and depends upon our loyalty to British rule in India. I shall be the last person, gentlemen, to suspect our neighbours of evil intentions, but I do not hesitate in declaring that unless the leaders of the Congress make sincere efforts as speedily as possible, to quell the hostility against the Government and the British race, which is fast increasing in a large body of their followers, the necessary consequence of all that is being openly done and said to-day will be that sedition would be rampant, and the Musalmans of India would be called upon to perform the necessary duty of combating this rebellious spirit, side by side with the British Government, more effectively than by the mere use of words.

It is however our duty towards our neighbours that as far as our influence may reach and our persuasion may work, we must prevent our friends and neighbours from going on the

wrong path, and as their neighbours it is always one of our first duties to deal with them with fairness and courtesy and, without prejudice to our legitimate rights and interests, to carry on with them an intimate social intercourse, maintain our sympathy, and strictly avoid all forms of hostility towards them. I would go even a step further, and impress upon you, gentlemen, that there is no quarrel between us and the National Congress and the Congress people, nor do we oppose or disagree with every one of their acts and views. Indeed we are thankful to them for the efforts which they have made in causes common to us both, and procured certain advantages in which they and we have equally shared, and it is quite possible that we may regard in the future a part of their programme as perfectly justified. All the differences that now exist between us and them, or shall exist at a future date, must fall under one or other of three heads. Either they will relate to those demands of theirs which, if granted, would endanger the continuance of British rule in India ; or they will relate to those efforts of theirs which are directed against our own legitimate interests ; or they will fall under the head of that want of moderation and respect which are due from the subjects to their sovereign. And this leads me to say that we must bear in mind that moderation and respectfulness shall have to be the essential characteristics of any political organization which the Musalmans assembled here to-day would form. I cannot help recalling the pleasure which I experienced when, in reply to the Address of the Musalmans' deputation to the Viceroy, of which I had the honour to be a member, His Excellency said that Musalmans of Eastern Bengal had behaved with remarkable moderation and courtesy under the most trying circumstances, and I have to congratulate the Hon'ble Nawab Salim-ul-lah Bahadur of Dacca and the Hon'ble Khan Bahadur Syed Nawab Ali Chowdhury on a result so eminently successful, which was brought about by their own efforts and the great influence they wield in Eastern Bengal, and we can rely that this influence will be used in the future, as it has been in the past, on the side of moderation, law, justice and courtesy.

ON THE ANNULMENT OF PARTITION OF BENGAL IN 1911

We perfecty agree that the action of the Government has given a real shock to all the Indian Moslems ; but we entirely disagree to dissolve our National organisation which binds us together and to identify in the great mass of the predominant community. In other words, we cannot run the risk of letting our rivulet fall into a mighty ocean—only to pass away into nonentity.

Our aloofness from the Congress and other bodies, is not based on our loyalty to the Government. Loyalty is an attribute and not the thing itself. It must have something else for its foundation and cannot evidently remain unshaken while the foundation receives a shock. The aloofness of the Mussalmans from the Congress, therefore, has been founded on the fact that some of the important demands of that body are prejudicial to Mussulman interests. The 'Swaraj' of the Congress is fatal to the Musalmans. The disappearance of the British Government from or even any decrease of its influence in India would be a calamity for us. That is to say, the same thing which may be regarded as nectar for our more fortunate brethren of the country, is poison for us, Mussulmans, who constitute the minority in this country. Whatever the result of the union of the two Bengals, it cannot affect the general truth contained in the above statement. If at all we have to live in India, it would be inadvisable to live in discord with the Government. To strive for the stability of the Government and to co-operate with it, is to strive, as it were, for our own stability. Therefore, let not such thoughts invade us. It is true that many times despair drags men to suicide. The idea of joining the Congress is undoubtedly the result of such despair, for the rise of which the Government is chiefly responsible. Yet never can we allow suicide to be recommended.

The question of our future policy, therefore, forces itself upon us. It is now as clear as the sun at noon, that in face of the transactions now before us, it is fruitless to offer any advice

to the Moslems to continue to depend on the Government. This is not the time for placing such trust. That which we should now lean upon, must be the power of our own arm, trusting alone in protection and blessing of our God. In this respect the example set by our honoured countrymen is before us.

For the Mussulmans of Eastern Bengal it is in the first instance, imperative to continue certain efforts.

Firstly : Not only once but several times in the year they should hold meetings of the Provincial Mohammedan Educational Conference. No district should be without a local branch connected with the Provincial Conference, which should have an office organised on a wide scale and well provided with all kinds of administrative reports, newspapers and other information. This Provincial Committee should constantly keep the authorities aware of their requirements and raise their voice in the Press also. If the appeals at first fail to have the desired effect the Committee should continue to do their duty till the Government is obliged to yield.

Also, the Committee should endeavour to the best of their ability to promote general and higher education in their province maintaining their connection strong with the All-India Mahommedan Educational Conference to which should be referred all such matters as may have failed to obtain a local hearing.

Secondly. Likewise all over the province District Leagues should be scattered with a Provincial League at their head and having its connection with the All-India Muslim League. While generally representing to the Government, at their meetings and by means of correspondence, the claims and requirements of the Mussulmans of their province, their chief concern should be to see that the Moslem voice is not weakened in the Legislative Council of the Government of the United Bengal. In fact the Provincial Leagues can do much.

Thirdly. As (there) will be some delay before the result of the representations of the Conference and the League could be expected, the immediate concern of the Leaders of Muslims in Eastern Bengal (who have, through the weakness and indifference of the Government unfortunately failed to keep up the dignity of their Province) should be to make haste and lay before the Government their proposals as to the measures by means of which their interests and their present progressive state can be protected and maintained. They should vehemently urge that during the presence of His Majesty in India a declaration of the adoption of these measures be made by the Government. So long as the wound is fresh, a cure is possible —it is afterwards that it becomes incurable.

4

SYED AMEER ALI

[If the two Nawabs (Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Viqar-ul-Mulk) could achieve a high career due to their administrative capabilities and the patronage of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, Syed Ameer Ali (1849—1928) could have a brilliant career of his own because of his profound scholarship of law and the patronage of His Highness the Agha Khan. With characteristic energy he played instrumental in launching the British Crescent Society that did admirable work in many parts of the world. He also helped in the formation of the National Indian Association in 1871. Like Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, he took a critical view of the teachings of Islam for espousing the cause of his coreligionists. As he had made a mark for himself both as a magistrate and a public-spirited figure he was nominated by the Governor as a member of the Bengal Legislative Council for a term of two years (1878-80) that was followed by his renomination for another term. Then the Viceroy nominated him as a member of the Supreme Legislative Council in 1883. When the conscientious people of Bengal formed Indian Association and India League in 1875, he dubbed them as political organisations of the Hindus. It shows that he was the first important figure to visualise that the Muslims should have their own political organisation. Like Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, he held the view that the Muslims constituted a separate *millat* (nationality) marked by a distinct religion, race and ideals. Subsequently a memorandum on behalf the Central National Muhammedan Association was submitted to the Viceroy in 1892 demanding special consideration for the educational advancement of the Muslims and also their adequate representation in public services. In May, 1908 the London Branch of the All-India Muslim League was set up and the Agha Khan appointed him

as its first President. Thus, on 27 January, 1909 he led a deputation that waited on the Secretary of State for India (Lord Morley) demanding separate electorates for the Muslims in Legislative Councils and Local Bodies. In the same year he was appointed as a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and thus had the credit of being the first Indian to hold the high judicial post of the Empire. But the support rendered by the Agha Khan and Syed Ameer Ali to the Caliph of Turkey annoyed the British rulers and the Public Prosecutor accused them as the 'real criminals'. He made Sussex his home town and died there after propagating the idea of a separate nationality of the Muslims and as a stout champion of the Muslim interests.]

ON SIMLA DEPUTATION OF 1906

Since the notable Resolution issued twenty one years ago by Lord Dufferin on the memorial of the Central National Mahommedan Association no more important declaration of policy has emanated from the head of the Indian Government than the reply of the Viceroy to the Mahommedan Duputation that waited on him at Simla on the 1st of October. For although Lord Minto spoke with a certain reserve, which was only natural under the circumstances, there can hardly be any question (that) his words indicate the general attitude of his Government towards the Mussulmans of India. Apart from its importance as a political pronouncement, it shows a clear appreciation of the existing situation and the growing difficulties of British administration, helped by its own extraordinary tendency to lean more or less exclusively on one element in the work of government. It shows, further, that the State begins to realise its responsibility towards the Mussulman people and the unwisdom of overlooking their interests in the multiplicity of claims pressed upon its attention with unvarying persistency by more articulate sections of the Indian nationalities. Hitherto, according to general Mahommedan opinion, the eyes of Government—with a short interlude—have been fixed on one class. Lord Minto's tactful and sympathetic reply bids them hope for a change.

The resolve of the Mahommedans, after a lapse of twenty-three years, again to approach the Viceroy personally points to a consciousness of the danger that lies before them, if they remain dormant and devoid of political life and activity much longer, of becoming entirely submerged under the rising tide of an exclusive nationalism.

The Deputation is the first concerted action on their part, conceived in a constitutional spirit without implying offence to any other people, to assert their rights to equitable treatment as subjects of a common sovereign—a treatment which certainly from their point of view has so far not been extended to them.

Not that the necessity for such united action did not present itself to them before ; for, as early as 1882, it was perceived by the more thoughtful that the course events were taking rendered some collective efforts to safeguard their interests absolutely essential. The increasing preponderance of the majority in all departments of the State, the indifference, not to say intolerance, of the official classes towards Mussulman needs and wishes, their own disintegration in some parts and political inaction everywhere had almost completely driven them into the background. Although in Upper India the conflict of special interests had not assumed an overt shape, the subsequent controversy about the Urdu language and character, decided by Sir Antony Macdonell against the Mahommedans, showed that even there the balance required adjustment

To obtain some amelioration of the situation, a scheme was set on foot for holding in Calcutta and other principal cities of India annual conferences of representative delegates to discuss questions affecting the material and educational development of the Mussulman community under the auspices of the British crown, to advise Government as occasion arose with regard to their needs and requirements, and to give it every assistance in the promotion of the general well-being. Such conferences were not meant to be in any sense exclusive or antagonistic to any other community, but were rather to work in conjunction with other organisations in the advancement of national welfare.

The scheme came to naught, owing to the opposition of some leading Mahommedans, whose eyes were fixed in a different direction Two years later came the 'National Congress', which, by a vigorous propaganda and the free use of the methods commonly called 'political agitation', has acquired a remarkable, although perhaps unacknowledged ; ascendancy in the counsels of Government. In this it has been greatly assisted by outside help, which has always been denied to the Mahommedans. This denial of sympathy and support to the Mussulmans is due, perhaps, as much to a bias against their religion as to the general lack of the talent to ingratiate themselves with people of influence, whether officials or travelling philanthropists.

Besides the Bharata Dharma Mandal, which ostentiously proclaims for its object the regeneration of India on strictly orthodox lines, the 'National Congress' is the most active organisation for giving expression to the vast aims and aspirations of the majority. Its sphere of activity is widening in every direction ; it keeps at arm's length uncongeni l elements, and suppresses dissent within and unfriendly criticism outside by boycott and denunciations. The goal of the 'Moderates', and 'Extremists' into which it has been divided by recent political writers, is the same ; only the method of reaching it is different.

These remarks are conceived in no unfriendly spirit, for I admire the ability and consistency of purpose which have enabled its leaders to attain its present success and solidarity.

A few Mahommedans have thrown in their lot with the Congress ; and, although they have exposed themselves to some ridicule, their motives are intelligible and not unreasonable. They believe a few scraps to be better than none, and think that under an avowed regime of the majority they would have a far better chance than now of sharing in the proverbial 'loaves and fishes'. But so far the bulk throughout the country has held aloof. They have pinned their faith on the permanence of British rule in India as the only means under present condi-

tions of her continuous development,—as the only means to prevent anarchy within or invasion from outside.

Their attitude has been influenced not so much by the exhortations or advice of any particular individual as by the general consciousness that without any positive safeguarding guarantee—which, in view of the exclusive spirit that had sprung up in many quarters, *malgre* the protestations at the top, it was impossible to obtain— the interests of the minority were sure to go under. They felt that their interests were certain to be relegated to the background, to be treated as of no consequence compared to those of the majority. And this is the view which the Mussulman memorial reflects.

In a State organism principally consisting of two distinct elements, one strong by its number and the general intelligence, ability, and political consciousness of its educated sections, the other virile, animated by those traditions of power and learning which impart backbone to a nation, equally intelligent but lacking the ready aptitude of adaptation and backward in the spirit of organisation and 'pushfulness', the Government has chosen to leave the less practically active element neglected and depressed. Whether this policy has brought it any strength or earned the gratitude of either party the future historian of India will be able to answer.

By an irony of fate the necessity for a constitutional movement on the part of the Mahommedans to obtain in some measure a restoration of the balance seems at this juncture to be appreciated most at Aligarh. It has taken a quarter of a century to enfore the lesson that, even under fairly progressive Governments, in the struggle for existence and race for progress, no nationality can allow itself to be lulled into sleep without facing the defeat which overtook the hare in the old-world fable.

Barely two months ago I noted in this Review[1] the peculiarly difficult position occupied by the Mussulman subjects of His Majesty :

1. 'India and the New Parliament', August 1906.

'Whilst the non-official Anglo-Indian and the Hindu communities possess powerful institutions for safeguarding their rights and privileges and asserting their claims to consideration and fairplay, the Indian Mussulmans are suffering acutely from political inanition. Material decadence and general want of touch with modern thought have brought about a deplorable state of disintegration. The associations that exist in different parts of the country possess no solidarity and display no conception of the essential requiremen's of the community. There is no concerted action to prevent further decline of their people, to promote their advancement, to place before Government their considered views on public matters, or to obtain relief from the mischiefs arising from the misunderstanding of their laws and customs.

'To find one nationality not pressing its claims to an equal recognition of its rights is undoubtedly an advantage ; it saves embarrassment. Thus, generally speaking, the Mussulman, whilst he is patted on the back for holding aloof from what is called 'political agitation', and told to apply himself like a good boy to his books ; when it comes to practical treatment is relegated to the cold shade of neglect. Official statistics show that in Upper India the proportion of Mahommedans receiving education is greater than that of their Hindu fellow-subjects. In the other provinces they have admittedly made great progress And yet in the matter of public employment or official recognition they are as unfavourably situated as ever. The reason is simple. They have no political influence and cannot make their voice properly heard in the council-chamber or office room.'

And I ventured to add :

It must not be supposed that the Mussulmans are devoid of the political instinct or oblivious of the value of collective action. They note as keenly as any other people the signs of the times ; and in this lies the seriousness of the situation. In the absence of a recognised organisation capable of expressing freely and openly the sentiments and opinions of the Mahom-

medans as a body, the feelings of the masses are likely to take a wrong shape and find outlet through unregulated channels.

In studiously moderate language the memorialists have sounded a similar note of warning :

'The Mussulmans of India (they say) have hitherto placed implicit reliance on the sense of justice and love of fair dealing that has always characterised their rulers, and have in consequence abstained from pressing their claims by methods that might prove at all embarrassing ; but, earnestly as we desire that the Mussulmans of India should not in the future depart from that excellent and time honoured tradition, recent events have stirred up feelings, especially among the younger generation of Mahommedans, which might, in certain circumstances and under certain contingencies, easily pass beyond the control of temperate counsel and sober guidance.'

In spite of the bogey of Pan-Islamism, conjured up by fevered brains, which is responsible for much wild talk in the public press of England and France, the perspective of Anglo-Indians, officials and non-officials, as regards Mahommedans, has considerably altered within recent years. They are regarded now as one of the most loyal nationalities of India : in fact, their loyalty has come to be recognised as one of the 'bulwarks' of the British Empire. It is felt that to neglect any longer a people which, by its self-control under the most trying circumstances, has shown itself worthy of help and support, would be equally unjust and impolitic.

At this moment a commission, appointed by the Viceroy at the invitation of His Majesty's Secretary of State, is deliberating over certain proposals to afford a larger scope for the employment of qualified Indians in the higher departments of State service, to further enlarge that Legislative Councils, and to extend the principle of election. All these subjects are admittedly of the utmost importance to the Indian Mussulmans. To have missed the opportunity of representing the

Mahommedan side of the question would have been fatal. For no thoughtful Indian, whatever his politics, can believe that the progress of India can be promoted by depressing or keeping in the background one nationality in favour of another.

The memorial presented by the Deputation, although it omits to notice one or two points, expresses in moderate and dignified language the views and feelings of the Mahommedan people with respect to the questions before the commission. Neither their moderation nor their self-restraint will spare the memorialists from the sectional indignation to which all attempts to seek justice for another body are exposed. But the prayers are so well founded and legitimate that they cannot fail to command the approval and sympathy of every class interested in the welfare of India.

The memorial presents for the consideration of Government two questions, *viz.* : (1) the employment of the Mahommedans in the service of the State ; and (2) their representation on the Provincial and Viceregal Councils, on the Municipal and Local Boards, and on the Senates and Syndicates of the Indian Universities. With regard to the first they say :

'We beg to observe that the political importance of a community to a considerable extent gains strength or suffers detriment according to the position the members of that community occupy in the service of the State. If, as it is unfortunately the case with the Mahommedans, they are not adequately represented in this manner, they lose in the prestige and influence which are justly their due. We therefore pray that Government will be graciously pleased to provide that, both in the gazetted and the subordinate and ministerial services of all Indian provinces, a due proportion of Mahommedans should always find place. Orders of like import have, at times, been issued by local governments in some provinces, but have, unfortunately, not in all cases been strictly enforced, on the ground that qualified Mahommedans were not forthcoming. This allegation, however true it may

have been at one time, is no longer tenable now; and wherever the will to employ them is not wanting the supply of qualified Mahommedans, we are happy to be able to assure your Excellency, is greater than any possible demand. Since, however, the number of qualified Mahommedans has increased a tendency is unfortunately perceptible to reject them on the ground of relatively superior qualifications having to be given precedence. This introduces something like the competitive element in its worst form, and we may be permitted to draw Your Excellency's attention to the political significance of the monopoly of all official influence by one class. We may also point out in this connection that the efforts of Mahommedan educationists have from the very outset of the education movement among them been strenuously directed towards the development of character, and this, we venture to think, is of greater importance than mere mental alertness in the making of a good public servant.'

To understand the exact import of this prayer it would be necessary to glance for a moment at the actual position of the Mahommedan element in the various branches of the public service.

Up to the time of Lord William Bentinck, the philanthrophic Governor-General who desired to pull down the Taj at Agra, the balance between the two great nationalities was fairly even. Perhaps it inclined somewhat in favour of the Mahommedans. The East India Company had obtained from a Mahommedan emperor the functions of collecting the revenue of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa; and, although many changes had been introduced since then in the administration affecting the position of the Mussulmans, the tradition was still maintained that, in view of the compact of 1765, they were entitled to more liberal consideration than any other community. From 1826 the attitude of Government underwent a change. The result was a gradual depletion of the Mussulman element in all branches of the public service open to Indians. In 1871 the proportion of Mahommedans to their Hindu

compatriots in what is called the gazetted appointments was less than one-seventh ; in 1882 it had fallen below one-tenth.

As regards the lower grades the distribution of State patronage bore an extraordinary character. A few figures taken at random will illustrate this observation. In the Foreign Office staff, consisting of 54 officers, only one was a Mahommedan. The same was the case in the Home Department Staff, composed of 63 officers. In the Departments of Finance and Revenue, formed of 75 officers, in the Comptroller-General's Office, with a staff of 63 officers, in the office of the Secretary to the Government of Bengal (General and Revenue Department), with a staff of 90 officers of a superior grade, in the Judicial, Political, and Appointment Departments, composed of 82 officers, in the office of the Accountant-General of Bengal, with 181 officers, not a single Mahommedan enjoyed office. In the Board of Revenue, with 113 assistants, only one was a Mahommedan. Similarly in the office of the Inspector-General of Registration in Bengal there was only one In the Customs Department, with a staff of 130 principal officers and assistants, and the Mahommedans were conspicuous by their absence from the muster roll. In the Preventive Department, in the Calcutta Collectorate, in the office of the Director-General of Post-Offices in India there was not a single Mahommedan. In the Postal Department, out of 2,035 officers, only 110 were Mahommedans. In the Telegraph and Public Works Department none. Out of 421 Officers in the Department of Public Instruction only 38 were Mahommedans. In the High Court of Calcutta, out of 298 officers, only 47 ; and in the Calcutta Court of Small Causes, out of 27 ministerial officers only one was a Mahommedan.

In the Eastern districts of Bengal—*viz.* Fureedpore, Pubna, Mymensingh, Rajeshahye, Chittagong, Midnapore, Rangpore, etc., the Mussulman population is considerably larger than the Hindu, in some places forming two-thirds at least of the population. In the Fureedpore district in 1882 out of a total of 366 Government employees only 30 were Mahommedans. In

Mymensingh, out of 344, only 20 were Mussulmans. In Midnapore, out of 499 only 39, in Pubna, out of 205 only 26, in Rajshahye, out of 338 only 57 ; and in Barisal, out of 423 not more than 36 belonged to the Mussulman community.

Since then English education has advanced by leaps and bounds among the Indian Mahommedans ; it would be interesting and edifying to know how, after twenty-one years' working of Lord Dufferin's Resolution, the proportion stands to-day. The official list, which gives the names only of office holders in the superior grades, is instructive. In the Provincial service to which oppointments are invariably made in India, out of 42 subordinate judges in Bengal, only one, so far as I can see, is a Mahommedan.[1] Out of 75 deputy magistrates in the first four grades, 13 are Mahommedans. In Eastern Bengal among the 10 subordinate judges, not one is a Mahommedan ; out of 19 deputy magistrates in the second, third, and fourth grades, only one is a Mussulman. In the first grade there is not one.

In 1822, out of 261 munsiffs, who rank below the subordinate judges, 14 were Mahommedans. It may well be asked, 'Has there been any improvement since then ?'

In the other presidencies the condition is no better.

In the Bombay Presidency out of 18 subordinate judges of the first class only one is a Mahommedan, and that in Sindh, which is largely a Mahommedan province. Similarly one lucky follower of Islam finds a place among 22 deputy collectors in the first four grades. In the Madras Judicial Service, out of 165 appointments, 135 are held by Hindus, 26 by Europeans and Eurasians, and only 2 by Mahommedans. In the Executive Branch, out of 23 incumbents in the first three grades, a solitary Mussulman forms the exception. *The Moslem Patriot* of Madras states that in the 'Salt, Abkari, and Customs Department,' where strength of character is more important than University qualifications, out of a total of 1,056 officers 223 are

1. In 1882 out of 56 officers, 3 were Mahommedans, 44 Hindus and 9 Europeans.

Europeans, 790 Hindus and only 43 Mahommedans. Whilst a Mussulman correspondent in the *Times of India* of the 15th of September points out that out of 225 officers employed in the various judicial and executive capacities in the Bombay Presidency only eight are Mahommedans. In the Punjab Provincial Service, out of 44 officers in the first grades, only 12 are Mahommedans ; whilst in the Upper Provinces, out of 44 subordinate judges, only 13 are Mahommedans, and in the Executive Branch of the Provincial Service in the first four grades, out of 51 officers 16 belong to the Mussulman faith.

Among the ministerial staff - the host of assistants and clerks — the disparity everywhere is till more disheartening. With these facts before us we can hardly wonder at the ranking sense of injustice which, it is useless to disguise, pervades the educated classes of Indian Mahommedans. Many of them have by dint of perseverance and industry acquired the education that has been held out to them as the passport to State employment. Like their more active and pushful compatriots, they entertain the legitimate ambition of sharing in State Patronage. Their sentiments naturally affect the feelings of the general body. It is to their credit that they have hitherto abstained from clamour, and so far maintained unshaken loyalty to the British Crown.

A consistent and statesmen-like endeavour, which will not allow itself to be diverted from the pursuit of its object by adverse criticism, to redress the grievances of the classes from whom the public service is, or in the ordinary course would be recruited, the only remedy that can satisfy the Mahommedans and restore their confidence in British justice.

This in substance is the prayer of the memorialists. It is neither extravagant nor unfair to any other community. They recognise it is only human nature that men should help relations, friends, and fellow-castemen, and try to hold the door against 'Aliens'. The desire for monopoly is not the characteristic of one continent. But they consider it to be the duty

of the State to hold the balance regardless of sectional clamour, with even justice.[2]

As the first step towards the fulfilment of the promise held out to the Deputation, a complete and exhaustive return should be called for, showing the relative proportion of Mussulman employees, save, perhaps, in the menial grades. The return should be submitted periodically to the Government of India and Home Government. This would enable the superior and controlling authorities to form an adequate idea of the situation, and to keep an eye on the process of amelioration. Heads of departments should be required to deal personally with the applications, and to see that all classes receive fair play. Vacancies, again, should be notified in the provincial gazettes and local publications, in Vernacular and English. Above all, I submit, the rules laid down in Lord Dufferin's Resolution should be strictly enforced.

The memorialists have laid great emphasis on the subject of Mahommedan representation in the Legislative Councils. The functions of these chambers have greatly altered within the last few years; the non-official members have obtained the right of interpellation, which enables them not only to indicate the trend of public opinion, but often to call attention to grievances the ventilation of which otherwise would be left to

2 The allegation of the Mahommedans that the unpopularity of the late Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal was in great measure due to his proclaimed desire to do them justice does not seem to be unwarranted The avowed organ of the 'National Congress' in London in commenting on the well-known Lyon Circular, in which certain rules were laid down for the admission of Mahommedans to public offices had the remarkable heading for its paragraph 'Religious Test not Merit' : and now an agitation is said to be on foot to get the Circular rescinded. 'This, I am afraid, is not the spirit which would win the sympathy of the Mussulmans in Congress enterprises; nor does it appear to be in accord with the *modus vivendi* suggested by one of the Congress journals in Bengal for Mahommedan cooperation. One of the suggestions was that 'in any case they' (*i.e.* the two communities) 'should never cry out when any undue favour is shown by Government to either of them '

irresponsible journalists. It has also become the practice for government, at the conclusion of the Legislative Section, to detail, for the information of the Council, its financial and in some respects its general administrative policy, thus giving the members an opportunity for criticism and comment on the measures proposed. A further 'enlargement' of the Councils and extension of the principle of election, with possibly a widening of their functions, are on the tapis. Under these circumstances it is of vital importance to the Mahommedans to be properly represented in the Supreme and Provincial Councils.

The memorialists do not appear to overstate their claim when they say that 'in any kind of representation, direct or indirect (the share accorded to the Mussulman community) should be commensurate, not merely with their numerical strength, but also with their political importance and the value of the contribution they make to the defence of the Empire ; and that in this connection due consideration should be given to the position which they occupied in India a little more than a hundred years ago, and of which the traditions have naturally not faded from their minds.'

The general interests of the different nationalities of India under British rule are identical, but the Mahommedans have special interests besides ; and their claims with regard to these can be represented in a satisfactory manner only by competent men of their own faith enjoying the confidence of the bulk of their people. Hitherto, with very rare exceptions, Mahommedan members have been nominated by Government. Considering the difficulties which surround the task, it must be admitted that the selections have, on the whole, been remarkably successful. But it cannot be denied that under the system of nomination the representation of Mahommedans has by no means been adequate. In the Legislative Council of Bengal, if I am not mistaken, there are seven Hindu members to two Mahommedans ; in the Legislative Council of the United Provinces five Hindus and two Mahommedans ; in the Legislative Council of

Bombay, nine Hindus and Parsees and two Mahommedans. In the Madras Legislative Council, out of twenty members eight are Hindus and one a Mahommedan.

The reply of the Viceroy gives the Mahommedans the assurance that in the remodelling of the constitution their claims to proper representation would be fully borne in mind. It is therefore necessary to consider how that object can be best attained. With the extension of the principle of election, the position of a nominated member could hardly fail to become invidious; his opinions and his vote would be discounted as that of a Government nominee. The memorialists have pointed out with conclusive force that, to leave the election of Mahommedan members in the hands of electoral bodies as at present constituted, would reduce the principle to absurdity. The only possible solution—the only means, in fact, of ensuring the proper and fair representation of the Mahommedan element in the Viceregal and Provincial Councils—is by confining to the several communities the election of their own representatives. Any other system would land the State in confusion and leave the Mahommedans stranded.

Whilst ordinarily the choice or representatives should be left to the two communities separately, the power of nomination should be retained for remedying the balance whenever occasion may arise for its exercise.

The election of members for the Provincial Councils should, I submit, be confided to the following classes of individuals:

(*a*) Mahommedan members of the district and municipal boards, members of the learned professions, merchants, and persons holding office under Government with an emolument of more than a hundred rupees a month.

(*b*) Pensioners drawing an allowance of not less than fifty rupees a month.

(*c*) Persons deriving a permanent income of a hundred rupees a month from house or landed property.

(*d*) Graduates of the Universities of five years' standing.

(*e*) Oriental scholars who have held scholarship of fifty rupees a month not otherwise disqualified.

(*f*) Holders of any title or distinction from Government.

With regard to Mahommedan representation in the imperial Legislative Council, the memorialists make an important submission. They urge that the proportion of Mahommedan 'representatives should not be determined on the basis of the numerical strength of the community, and that in any case the Mahommedan representatives should never be an ineffective minority.' And they suggested that the election should be entrusted to an electoral body composed of 'Mahommedan landowners, lawyers, merchants, and representatives of other important interests of a status to be determined by Government, Mahommedan members of the Provincial Councils, and Mahommedan fellows of the Universities. To my mind it would be simple, certainly less complicated, to leave the election in the hands of the Mussulman members of the several provincial councils, but the field of selection should not be confined to their own body.

These suggestions are submitted as mere tentative hints for the consideration of the commission to whom has been confided the task of devising a practical scheme which would safeguard the interests and satisfy the reasonable aspirations of all communities. In the decision regarding the proportion in which the different elements should be represented, a variety of considerations will naturally enter. At a time when unrest and excitement in one province which has derived the greatest benefit from British rule wears the appearance of developing into strife and disorder, the qualities of self-restraint, of a spirit of compromise and some conception of the limitation to political activity will probably not be overlooked.

The election of members to the Councils does not offer to my mind the same difficulty as that to the District and Local Boards, which to use the language of the memorialists, forms

as it were 'the initial rungs in the ladder of self-government.' Hitherto Mahommedan representation on these bodies has been to them a constant source of heart-burning. And it will continue to be until the proportion of members from two communities is definitely fixed and the election left to them separately.

The memorialists have put so clearly the cause of the Mahommedans as regards representation in the public service, the Councils, and the Local Bodies, that it may appear somewhat ungracious to call attention to what seems an ommission. For there is no illusion in the memorial to the defective administration of Mahommedan law in the British Indian Courts of Justice. The appointment of qualified Mahommedans to the High Courts of India is unquestionably a matter of importance ; and the memorialists are right in their contention that, having regard to the fact that learned Bengali lawyers sit on the bench in the Punjab Chief Court and High Court of Allahabad, there is no reason whatsoever against taking a competent Mahommedan from the Punjab or Allahabad to the other provinces, and vice versa. Nor ought it to be overlooked that the community of language, sentiment, and traditions places the Mahommedans of the different provinces on a common platform, and constitutes them in an emphatic sense one nationality.

But in my opinion the proper administration of Mahommedan law will not be placed on a satisfactory basis until there is a large increase in the number of Mahommedans in the ranks of the subordinate judiciary.

Twenty-four years ago, in connection with these questions, I ventured to make in the columns of this Review the following remarks :

'The depressed and despairing condition of the Mahommedan demands the serious attention of Government, and should not be dealt with any longer in the *dilettante* way which has hitherto been the fashion, but in a real earnest manner. A

nation consisting of upwards of fifty millions of souls, 'with great traditions, but without a career,' deprived by slow degrees of wealth and influence by a policy of mistaken sentimentalism, mixed with a contemptuous disregard for popular feelings, must always constitute an important factor in the administration of India. It is this factor which cannot be ignored, and which must be taken into account by Government in all future projects for the well-being of India.'[3]

To-day the most influential organ in the English press repeats the warning in stronger language :

'We have now reached a stage where assurance will be quite valueless unless they are backed by deeds. If the Indian Government does not retain the confidence of loyal minorities by a steady and consistent policy, then, in words recently quoted in our columns, we may expect to see the Mahommedans either join the Congress or set up a second agitation of their own.'

The eventful success, however, of the constitutional movement inaugurated by the Deputation rates on the Mussulmans themselves and their prominent men. Occasional and sporadic efforts of this kind will lead to no permanent result. Measures change with men. To watch over the development of the Mahommedan people, to protect their interests, to see that their claims to equitable treatment are not neglected, to work loyally with the Government, and, in a spirit of fairness and compromise, with all other communities in the promotion of the common welfare, they should have permanent and influential associations in every district and in every province acting in conjunction with and under the guidance of a central organisation located in some place like Aligarh, which focusses at this moment the intellectual life and p olitical activity of th Mahommedans of India.

3. A Cry from the Indian Mahommedans, August 1882. According to the last census, the Mahommedan population directly subject to British exceeds sixty two millions.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR ON THE PROPOSED INDIAN REFORMS*

There is evidently a misapprehension in some quarters regarding the attitude of the Muslim League (and of the Muslims generally) towards Lord Morley's scheme of Indian reforms, and attempts are being made to discount or discredit Muslim feelings and opinion.

The Muslims equally with other moderate sections of the population gratefully acknowledge with extension of political privileges. But they are bound to examine the details so that in the practical application of the scheme they may not be placed at a disadvantage. This, they believe, would not only be contrary to the intentions of Government, but probably prove fatal to the successful working of the reforms. In asking for modifications such as would properly and adequately safeguard their interests, they ask for no special privilege in derogation of the just rights of any other class or community: they demand nothing more than that their representation on the Councils and other representative bodies should under the projected reforms be real and not illusory, substantial and not nominal. They are anxious to work in harmony with all sections of the population, but they will not consent to be dragged at the wheels of a majority along any course it may choose to take. Thus, if I interpret rightly the feelings and opinions of my people, is the position they have taken up

During the whole course of my public life I have consistently laboured to promote concord and good feeling among the two communities. I have always maintained cordial relations with leading Hindus. My remarks, therefore, will perhaps be accepted as free from bias of any kind.

In India the rank and file of the two communities are still widely divided in habits, customs and traditions of race and religion a more dominant factor than in European countries—

**The Times*, London, 14 January, 1909.

all of which tend to produce the feelings and thoughts which govern the actions of peoples. The Hindu is most anxious to preserve and extend the ascendancy he has gained, the Muslim aspires to obtain a share of the benefits promised to India by British rule. Under existing conditions and in the present state of feeling among the general body of the two nationalities a system of popular electorates recommended in the despatch of the Secretary of State would lead to constant friction, heart-burnings and complaints. In certain localities (and recent events fully justify the prediction) worse results may be apprehended.

That a joint electorate consisting of Hindus and Muslims under such conditions would not assure adequate representation to the Muslim community would be obvious to any unprejudiced mind. But the question has been clouded with so many fallacies that it becomes necessary to call attention to some of the salient features of the proposal against which Muslim opinion as unanimous ranged itself.

Under the proposed scheme (without going into details) the electoral machinery at every stage would be controlled by an overwhelming non-Muslim majority versed in modern political tactics. This explains the exultation with which it has been received and the tenacity with which the Muslim demand for communal representation is objected to. In electorates of the kind proposed every effort would be made to divide Muslim votes, and to return to the electoral colleges and the councils only such Muslims as would be acceptable to the majority. At this moment in some parts of the country Extremist views are predominant here, it is needless to say, no Muslim, unless he subscribed to these doctrines, would have the remotest chance of election. Not much exercise of imagination is required to understand the combinations by which a Muslim unacceptable to the majority may be defeated.

In considering the question of mixed electorates another fact must be borne in mind. The two communities often differ greatly in material circumstances. No Muslim is found following

the vocation of *Sahukar, Mahajan,* or *Baniya,* in the legal and other professions his number can hardly be compared to that of Hindus. In state service the disparity is striking. Owing to the difference in the standard of living, rank to rank, generally speaking the Muslim is less affluent than the Hindu. Under these conditions the franchise qualification would have to be sensibly modified, otherwise the franchise limit would be so narrowed as to make Muslim representation practically of little value.

To allay Muslim apprehensions Lord MacDonnell states in *The Times* of 6 January that Morley's scheme aims at securing to the Muslims a proportionate *minimum* representation ; and that it does not preclude the electors or the majority of them from foregoing the advantage they possess, and giving to the minority a particular election a larger representation that the *minimum* to which under the scheme they are entitled. So that, according to him, if one Muslim obtained the entire Muslim votes, and another a larger number of Hindu votes, the result would be that Muslim instead of one would have the good fortune of possessing two representatives. With some experience in the interpretation of documents, I venture to say that the language of the despatch furnishes no warrant for Lord MacDonnell's construction. The intention may be there, it is not only not expressed, but also the context rebuts it.

Assuming, however, that Lord MacDonnell's interpretation is correct, it would be considered a very mixed blessing. A Muslim brought in wholly or partly by Hindu votes would be pledged wholly or partly to the view of his political supporters ; he would be used as a counterpoise to his Muslim colleague, and, to use a colloquialism, would often be putting a spoke in his wheel. Illustrations of how this may be done are not wanting in the House of Commons. A nominee of the majority posing as a Muslim representative would often do more harm to Muslim interests than if they were wholly unrepresented.

The principle of proportional representation possesses, no doubt, the recommendation of simplicity as furnishing an easy

solution to an unprecedentedly difficult problem. But its simplicity should not, it is submitted, lead us to overlook the prejudice it would cause to the Mahommedans. There is no question the Hindu population largely exceeds the Mahommedans in number; but the real figure in the first case is swelled to its stated dimensions by the inclusion of masses of people whose very touch the real Hindu regards as defilement, with whom he would hold no social converse, and who are called, or call themselves, Hindus for census purposes alone. Communities like those of the *Chandals*, *Chamars*, *Musahirs*, *Bhangis*, etc. names familiar enough to the Indian administrator—can never hope to rise in the social scale, or to sit in the same assembly as the caste-people, the real Hindus. They will in all probability never hear of Lord Morley's scheme or take the faintest interest in its working. The Mahommedans number according to official figures, over 53 millions. They are unequally distributed over the whole country, and vary in material and social conditions, not only in the different provinces, but in different parts of the same province. The only province in which there is any approximation in the circumstances of the two great communities is the Punjab. Here, the followers of Islam, like the Hindus, are found in all strata of society. Here, therefore, it may be possible to apply the principle of proportional representation without prejudice to the interests of either. But in the other provinces the conditions are totally different. For example, in the United Provinces, the upper and middle classes of Mahommedans are mostly office-holders, scholars, professional men, and what in French would be called rentiers of different degrees—descendants generally of men who occupied good positions under the former rule. The social importance of the Mahommedans in the life of the province, as has been admitted by successive governors, can hardly be gauged by their numerical proportion. Proportional representation applied to the United Provinces would work enormous injustice to Mahommedan representation, and would create a feeling of resentment of which indications are already forthcoming. The same remarks apply to other provinces.

If Mahommedan representation is to have any real meaning, it must be, as the Mahommedans urge adequate and substantial. If the Muslim representations are to be of any practical use to their people or to the State, representative bodies must be such as to give non-official majorities to the provincial councils and the further extension in their powers and privileges. The importance of a nation cannot always be adjusted on numerical considerations. Whatever may be the view regarding the historical and political position of the Mahommedans to which the Government of India attaches some value, Mahommedan loyalty is an asset to the Empire which I venture to submit ought not to be lightly put aside.

ON THE FUTURE OF ISLAM*

As I have the privilege of enjoying the friendship of the lecturer for whose talents and learning I have very great admiration, he will, I am sure, pardon me if in the few criticisms I venture to offer he finds anything in disagreement with his standpoint, or with his estimate of the religion I profess. I must say that in the discursive paper he read to us I did not exactly follow the thesis he was trying to work out. I do not know whether, speaking to an audience mostly consisting of Englishmen, he sought to show that Mahommedans ought to consider themselves fortunate in being under foreign and Christian ru'e, or whether he wanted to point out that the theory of Pan-Islamism, invented in Europe to justify attacks on Mussulman communities, is really baseless. If the former was his thesis, he has, no doubt, developed it to the satisfaction of this assembly. But I would remind him that there is such a thing as sentiment in this world, and that the late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman once told the House of Commons that nations felt that even bad rule by people belonging to their own race is better than the rule of aliens. I hope that neither the lecturer nor his assembly will deny all credit to those Mahommedans who are so ignorant as to prefer their

*A speech delivered at the Central Asian Society in London on the occasion of Professor Margoliouth's Lecture on Pan-Islamism on 10 January, 1912.

own rule to that of foreigners. Surely some weight ought to be attached even in these days to sentiment of the character. I believe that in European countries men who fight for their independence and refuse to be subjugated by aliens are usually called heroes ; but it seems that Mussulmans in similar conditions are not entitled to be called anything but fanatics. I have come across some Moors who were ignorant enough to dislike being subjugated by France. If anybody wishes to know how they are exploited by Frenchmen he has only to refer to a recent book by Mr. Leeder entitled 'The Gateway of the Desert'. It will give him some idea of the 'fanaticism' of the Moors. It will show the object to be exploited by foreigners who want to extract as much from them as possible. They object to their young men being turned into absinthe-drinking *flanneurs* and their young women into beings not usually mentioned in polite society. They say that women are entitled under the system prevalent amongst them to certain respect ; they do not wish to see them on the stage of the cafe chantant or adopting the tax manners often see in Western cities. I met some time ago an extremely able German diplomatist and he mentioned to me that these 'fanatical' Moors would have preferred an English to a French protectorate. He was modest enough to put the name of his own country second in this connection and I think this was very candid on his part. He said the Moors hated French domination largely because it meant the imposition upon them of French civilization in its least agreeable aspect. For my part I abominate that word 'civilization', having regard to the abuses it covers. Even religion is not responsible for so much crime towards weak nations as civilization. I hope this assembly will give some credit to these Mussulmans for cherishing sentiments which would here be called patriotic. It is a matter of regret that the lecture has not said one word in reprobation of the extraordinary enterprise in which Italy is engaged in Tripoli. She is waging there a war against a power with which she was on friendly terms up to the very moment she broke the peace. The Italians went to Tripoli on the allegation of releasing the Arabs from the Turkish yoke under which they groaned, that

they were to be the liberators of the Tripolitans. But these very Arabs are now laying down their lives not to be subjugated to foreign rule. The sentiment which has led them to join hands with the Turks can be well understood seeing that the peace and prosperity which existed in the Tripolitan basis have disappeared. Their plantations are ruined, the date palms have been cut down, and starvation stares the people in the face. That may be civilization which appeals to me. In saying all this with regard to recent attacks upon Moslem countries I wish it to be understood that I fully recognise the prosperity the Mussulmans enjoy in India under the rule of great Britain and I am persuaded that no Mussulman subject of King George has any feeling other than that of absolute loyalty to the British Crown. But they expect on their side also that some value should be attached to their feelings and sentiments, especially with regard to their cherished traditions.

The subject of the present lecture was brought before the Central Asian Society a few years ago by Mr. (now Sir) Valentine Chirol. On that occasion I ventured to say that this idea of Pan-Islamism, *viz.*, a combination of Mahommedans in an aggressive sense against European Powers, was a European invention with the object of raising a prejudice against Islam, and thus rendering the efforts to subjugate independent Moslem States more easy.

Pan-Islamism is a figment of the brain, an invention designed to help in destroying the liberty of Mussulman nations. If the insubstantiability of Pan-Islamism was the thesis of the lecturer then I am in hearty accord with him.

I hope you will forgive a personal reference when I say that for the last 37 years I have laboured to bring East and West together and keep the Moslem peoples of India steadfast in their devotion to the British Crown. The steadfastness is maintained, but it is, perfectly intelligible and absolutely natural that their sympathies should go out to their co-religionists in other parts of the world suffering from troubles which

from their nature ought to appeal to every man and every woman of whatever race or religion and stir the instincts of humanity and generosity in him or her. From all parts of India, from South Africa, from Malaya, in fact from every country inhabited by Mahommedans high and low, educated and uneducated, there has come evidence that they feel intensely in respect to, and sympathise deeply with their people in Persia, in Tripoli and in Morocco in the troubles and trials they are undergoing. Everywhere there is the greatest indignation and sorrow at the wanton injustice and suffering to which they are subjected. You will all admit that these feelings are at least exclusive and intelligible, and you will not be surprised then that Moslems should look to Great Britain to do what she can to relieve the situation. We recall what was done by Cromwell when the Vaudois were being massacred. One word from him sufficed to stop those massacres, and he left to England a noble memory. Surely the Moslems of India are entitled to express their spmpathy and desire to relieve the sufferings of their co-religionists, and no man, certainly no Englishman, has a right to question their right to do so or its naturalness or prosperity. I believe that in a time not far back the outrage on humanity and international justice which is so largely observed now with a certain amount of callousness would have sent a shock through the length and breadth of England, but things are changed !

If the thesis of the lecturer was that Islam being divided into sects there is no possibility of its uniting against any aggressive action of Europe or any other religion, I am willing to admit that the sects and peoples of Islam have no idea, and have never had any idea of combining to hurl themselves against the serried ranks of Europe, or that they are ever likely to rise against Great Britain or any other liberal Government. Still Europe might well talk to heart the lesson presented by Italian aggression in Tripoli. There was no cohesion between the Arabs and Turks there until the invasion took place ; but that has had the effect of uniting the Moslems throughout Northern Africa. If European nations indulge in these crusades

you must expect the various tribes and peoples and sects to sink their differences and to unite the defence against the common invader. But as to organised Pan-Islamism, I have never come across any missionary of it in the whole of my experience. To the Mahommedans of India the name of Jamal-ud-Din is scarcely known, and the cult that has been described to us is without following there. In respect to the Senussi, to whom Sir D.G. Bees referred, they have kept aloof from political movements, for they make a point to avoid political complications with foreign governments. The Senussi movement is one of a distant religious kin ; but what the effect of the invasion on Tripoli will be upon its adherents in altering their standpoint I cannot say.

The learned lecturer has a great deal to say about the divisions of Islam. He seems to have forgotten the divisions in Christiandom from the earliest times onwards, and that they continue to this day. I saw a book recently which described no less than 170 or 180 Christian sects. One of these sects, the Christadelphian, holds that the Messianic reign will begin with the massacre of all infidels.

There is one other point ; the lecturer holds the view that constitutional government is foreign to Islam. Well, I venture to say that if constitutional Government is intimately associated with any religions, it is that of Islam and on one knows better than our Chairman what a democratic religion it is. It is more socialistic and democratic than any other system I know of, and under it constitutional government flourished in old times. If the lecturer will look into the history of Islamic monarchies he will find that questions of state were settled by councils, that in some respects they were as representative as the systems which have been evolved by 600 years of democracy in this country. Councils sat and decided important issues at every period when Islam enjoyed any degree of prosperity. Saladdin himself had a council to which he submitted questions affecting the progress of his people. In Persia there were councils at the capitals and each town had its headman presiding over the

local corporation. The question will be asked, how it is that a system which so flourished was overtaken by decadence ? In my judgement this was due to the conflict with Christianity. The Crusaders are responsible for the destruction of the civilization and culture of Western Asia. In spain it was the Inquisition which destroyed the life and culture the Moors had created there.

I am sorry that one so gifted and learned as our lecturer should say that Islam is unsuited to constitutional government, and should overlook the fact that it is the calamities which have come from outside which have caused the decay of self-governing institutions in the Moslem world. The Islamic position has been entirely different from that of England, which has not been overrun by foreign foes since the distant days of William the Conqueror and thus been saved the trials and troubles to which the countries of Islam have been exposed. The Tartars reduced the most prosperous cities of Asia to ashes. Multitudes lost their lives in the sack of Baghdad, Herat, Nishapur and other places. I am sure the lecturer will excuse me for having pointed out that in my judgement his statements on many points need qualifications.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR*

Although your views on the Turkish question are opposed to those of the Muslim subjects of the King, you have never refused them a hearing, and I gratefully recognise yuur courtesy and fairness. Will you permit me at this critical moment in the history both of Turkey and the British empire to draw public attention to the certain result of the agitation that has been started against the decision of the Supreme Council, not to disturb the *status quo* in Constantinople and Thrace ? Many of its supporters have held high office in the State, and some of them are destined again to have charge of its affairs, and I am grieved to see that in their zeal they have employed towards their Muslim fellow-subjects language calculatcd to

**The Times*, London, 4 March, 1920.

aggravate the present unrest and ferment in India. Lord Bryce, the protagonist of the present attempt to stampede the Government, has in one of his many fulminations chosen to deride Muslim sentiment as 'shadow terrors' to recoil before which would do harm to British prestige. I venture to say that British administrators who have been in direct touch with the Indian people would tell him differently. To call the wave of intense and united feeling that is surging over India at this moment a 'fictitious agitation' is to deliberately shut one's eyes to the gravest situation that, in the opinion of the wisest observes, has arisen within the last half century.

In 1765 a Muslim Sovereign constituted the East India Company the chief revenue official in Eastern India in 1802 he delegated to the Company the Imperial authority. Since then Muslims have formed one of the staunchest elements in the Indian population. In the late war, tens of thousands laid down their lives in the cause of England ; Muslim princes and magnetes responded lavishly to the call for financial and material help, and the people at large gave their best unstintedly. The Army would probably be the first to acknowledge its debt to the Muslim soldiers in getting across the Jordan. Neither the soldiers who fought and died, nor the princes and people who regarded England's chief enemy as the common foe were told that they were helping in the last crusade and were to work for the eventual destruction of an institution and an Empire in which they are vitally interested. Had they had any inkling of the psychology at the back of the present agitation there would have been a great searching of heart on all sides. They are now being told that, although British subjects, possessed of the same constitutional rights as their Christian fellow-subjects, entitled to the same consideration in respect of their religious sentiments and political feelings, their feelings and sentiments are of no account, and could and should be trampled upon with impunity and regardless of consequences. What will all this lead to ? I can not help regarding the future of the Empire, of India, and of the East generally, with alarm and anxiety. India is seething with rage over recent 'regrettable

incidents', and here a wild fanatical agitation is set on foot with the inevitable result of inflaming the bitterest hatred and animosity on both sides.

On January 5, 1918, the Prime Minister, speaking in the name of England and the British nation, nay, of the British Empire, which includes over 100 millions of Muslims, said as follows—

'Nor are we fighting...to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and removed lands of Asia Minor and Thrace which are predominantly Turkish in race.'

This memorable declaration attained its object ; it removed the doubts and apprehensions that were gaining ground and assured the steadfastness of the Muslim soldiers. Muslims universally accepted it as a solemn pledge and maintained their trust in England's honour and England's good faith. Are England's honour and good faith of no value in her world-wide Empire ? The present outcry should have been raised when the pledge was given to a trustful world in the name of the British nation. It is un-British to take all the advantage out of it and then to turn round and raise a furious hue and cry against its fulfilment. The Muslims would be justified in regarding it as a gross breach of faith which at any other moment would have evoked strong disapproval, and committed by another nation would have received just condemnation.

We understand that in an unwary moment, under stress of circumstance, a facile statesmanship promised Constantinople to Turkish Russia. That Russia has disappeared. Over the death of Tsarism, England did not weep. Does Liberal England propose to revive it for the purpose of holding Constantinople, or is it intended that city should be entrusted to Soviet Russia.

The pleas for wresting Constantinople from the Turkish States and subjecting its Muslim population to Christian domination of one kind or another, or forcing them to expatriate themselves 'bag and baggage' are too flimsy to bear

examination. Constantinople is said to have been a cause of discord in the hands of the Turks : the discord was due to the rival ambitions of European States. Is it to be presumed that this last war has cleansed their hearts ? If not, is it supposed that an international control would prevent discord among them, or avert the war, which, you, Sir, apprehend ?

There is one strong consideration for the retention of the present *status quo* in European Turkey which does not, at this moment of religious excitement, appear to be realised. To drive the Turks out of Europe and pen them in wtihin the plateau of Anatolia would mean that they would be debarred from free inter-association with other nations, would be deprived of all touch with the modern world, and have no chance of development. They would brood in sullen anger over their wrongs and wait for the hour of revenge. This can hardly be regarded as a solution which will bring back peace and good will to a distracted world. Security and good treatment of the Christian minorities in the Eastern districts of Anatolia would be best assured by a generous and not a vindictive settlement with Turkey. It is hardly to be expected that if the Turks are driven out from Constantinople which, as Professor Grosvenor said, is more to them than Paris to France, or Rome to Italy and is regarded as a sacred city by the Muslims in general, it would add to their good feeling towards those whose cause has been so violently advocated in England.

The sense of fair play is a predominant characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon race but in moments or religious and political execution an appeal to the sense of fair play falls on deaf ears. And yet there are, I know, many in England who would like to hold the balance evenly between accuser and accused and not condemn a race unheard. The Turks have been called 'cruel' rulers ; these 'cruel rulers' gave a generous asylum to the Jews fleeing from the gibbet and the stake in Spain. They granted absolute toleration to their non-Muslim subjects when toleration was a word unknown to Europe ; they guaranteed to them the fullest enjoyment of their communal and religious

rights. The Greeks, the Americans, and the Jews have flourished under their 'cruel' rule. They have, no doubt, repressed ruthlessly risings and rebellions, fomented almost entirely from abroad But is there any nation that has not been ruthless in the treatment of rebellion ? When the account of 'terrible crimes' is made up be before an impartial jury and the balance is struck, it will not be found to be entirely against the Turks. The reports of the Russian officers in America, of the Allied Commission in Smyrna, and of the Carnegie Commission in Europe might, with justice, form the basis of an unbiased trial.

I maintain that Turkey has been allowed a dog's change in her endeavours to reform and reorganise her administration. From the later end of the 18th century she had a war forced upon her short intervals of 20 or 25 years and in some instances the respite was less. That any nation could survive this perpetual struggle for existence might appeal to a virile race like the British. Turkey again and over again appealed to England for help to put her Government in order ; her requests were invariably refused, in deference to Russia's wishes The Tsarist policy aimed at the destruction of Turkey both in Europe and Asia, and not at her improvement.

I cannot help marvelling at the extraordinary coincidence that brought the reports of the "massacres' at Marash two days after the announcement in the 'Temps' and other Paris papers, of the French policy in Cilicia. The first account put the number of victims as 700 ; next day it rose to 7,000 ; Saturday it fell to 1,500. In the East when an object is desired it is not difficult to achieve it. If a 'massacre' is wanted, it is easy to provoke a collision · an insult to a woman or the desecration of a place of worship sets the racial and religious animosities blaze. A few people are killed, and the whole world is aghast at a 'massacre'. In the present instance there has been no inquiry as to how it originated, who set it in motion and how many were killed on the other side of it, whether, serves the purpose in the hands of the propagandist.

I am not an apologist ; I have no desire to uphold any criminal, Muslim or Christian. I would raise my voice in favour of any nation, Buddhist, Christian, or Muslim, which I believed to be the victim of injustice, as in the present instance I consider Turkey to be. I cannot bring myself to believe that the love of justice and fair play has quite disappeared from the England I have known and loved for over 50 years. Still in that belief, I appeal to the British nation, first of all, not to condemn a people unheard ; and, secondly, not to allow the cherished feelings of their Muslim fellow subjects to be trampled upon and a gulf of bitterness and hatred created between the two great faiths within the British Empire.

the bitter failure of the Khilafat Movement in 1924, he, like Mohammed Iqbal, became a pan-Islamist through and through. With such a changed mind he criticised the recommendations of the Nehru Report (1928) and went to the extent of accusing Gandhiji as a communalist working under the influence of the Hindu Maha Sabha. At the first Round Table Conference held in London (November, 1930) he minced no words in revealing his fiery patriotism yearning for complete independence and also in accusing Gandhiji as the 'fighter for the supremacy of Hinduism and the suppression of the Muslims'. Shortly thereafter, in the words of H.G. Wells, he died leaving behind an impression of having the power of the pen of Macaulay, the tongue of Burke, and the heart of Napoleon.]

THOUGHTS AND IMPRESSIONS*

I

ON THE PRESENT DISCONTENT

Now that Indian journalism has become a seething cauldron of political controversy, it is doubtful if a patient hearing will be given to one who belongs to neither side in this trenchant partisanship, but sympathises with both. The point of view from which one should discuss the present discontent ought to be an independent one, and, perhaps, it will be conceded that one who is not a British servant, and hardly even a British subject, one who has no chance of participating in the most extended representation that could be granted to British India, is in as independent a position as could be conceived. Add to this the membership of the community which has, after fifty years of quiescence, earned a name for loyalty, and even the staunchest loyalist dare not say, with any show of justification, that the popular side is unduly favoured.

To presuppose, however, that discontent is the monopoly of certain communities or classes, or that the loyalty of any class, however more confirmed than that of another, frees it

---

*From *Select Writings and Speeches of Mohammed Ali*, Chapters I, XIII, XVIII, XIX, XX.

from the taint—if so it can be called, - of discontent, would be a mistake. I may as well state in the beginning that discontent in one form or another is universal in India to-day. Though some communities are free from the infection of political discontent, the Government cannot, on that account, apply the soothing unction, and fondly regard itself as popular. One of the most amazing features of the Indian situation is that the race which has conferred more benefits on Indian than any previous ruling race, whether Aryan, Afghan, or Moghal, is yet the most unpopular of all. There may not be—and I agree with Lord Ampthill that there is not,—any more active disloyalty in India than in the United Kingdom, but there is hardly any active loyalty either. The undoubted benefits of peace and security and civilization are accepted quietly, but the situation is tolerated passively rather than appreciated in any positive manner. Any yet the people of India are perhaps the most responsive to kindness, and the most grateful. This is the great paradox of the Indian situation, and the sooner it is understood the better.

But to take political discontent first. This is chiefly, but not exclusively, confined to the Hindus of Bengal, the Brahmans of Western India and the South, a very small minority of the Parsis, the Arya Samajists of the Punjab, and a small class of the educated Hindus of Upper India. Looked at from another point of view, it may be said that, barring the Parsis (who have found their peculiar genius in trade and industry rather than in politics) and the Muslims of Upper India and Behar, political unrest is common to all those classes which have received modern English education. The Muslims of other provinces are backward in this respect, and the Sikhs, Mahrathas, and Rajputs, who had ruled India with the Muslims until the final supremacy of the British, have received much less education than even the Muslims, and have hitherto not been much in evidence in public affairs. In a way, therefore, the present political unrest may be charged to the account of the British Government which has hitherto taken the fullest responsibility for the education of young India.

Muslim Attitude

As regards the Muslims of Upper India and Behar, who have received a fair amount of English education, their peculiar attitude in politics is wholly due to the guiding influence of one great man, Syed Ahmed Khan, the late founder of the Aligarh College. He found just fifty years ago that his co-religionists, who were always a virile community, were led into a blunder that cost thousands of respectable families not only the lives of many of their members but their all, and in spite of the unshaken loyalty of some, like Syed Ahmed Khan himself, they gave to the whole community an evil reputation for disloyalty.

It was the foresight of Sir Syed Ahmed which led away his community from the path of political discontent after the Mutiny. For full forty years he worked to divert the energies of the Muslims to the more peaceful pursuit of letters and science, so that they could fit themselves for the struggle of life. We are told by the Congressmen, including some leaders, that Syed Ahmed Khan was a traitor to his country. In that they betray not only their ignorance of the man and his work, but also of the characteristics of a real patriot. He only advised his co-religionists, brooding over the loss of power and prestige, and suspected of secret disaffection, to lie low and live down their unmerited reputation. And the result is that after half a century the Muslims of his Province produce a number of graduates every year in excess of the proportion of their population, and the community as a whole is regarded as one of the forces of loyalty in India. The fancy that Muslims were disloyal needed no assertion in 1857. The fact that they are a loyal body of men needs many agruments to controvert it in 1907. A writer in *East and West* for May says: "Of all the Indian population, the Mahomedans are not—as they are often represented to be,—the only friends of Government;" and similar complaints of "favoured nation treatment" are not wanting from even very high quarters. But it is forgotten that reputations are a game of see-saw, and that half a century ago when some Muslims had joined in a Mutiny started by others,

and as a result of it were down on their luck, there was none so poor to do them justice, much less reverence. No Hindu friend came forward to say that of all the Indian population the Muslims were not—as they were always represented to be,—the only enemies of Government. To-day there is no political discontent among them. But they are now on the threshold of a political career, and their actions and tendencies need careful observation. The community has its own grievances, its own aspirations. It too wants room for expansion. But the bias given to the bowl fifty years ago will still help it along, if the hand that throws it be a steady one. It is neither gratitude nor statesmanship to count too much on the past, and let the future take care of itself. The action of the Government in time to come, no less than the sympathetic control of its own leaders, will settle the future path of the community and decide its destiny. If the character of Aligarh education is distinctly superior in loyalty, which is only another name for good sense, it is no less distinct in amour-propre. Recent events have ruffled the tempers of those who may lightly be passed over low, but who will in no distant future be the elders of the community when the present elders are in their graves. When practically every educated community shows signs of political discontent, it is the task of statesmanship to save the one segregated community from the present infection.

Moderates and Extremists

It is clear that amongst the Hindus all the educated castes are one and all discontented politically. For Englishmen to believe, as they make out in the British Press at Home, that it is only a microscopic minority that is responsible for the present situation, is a great mistake. I do not necessarily mean that the discontent is wholly unjustifiable, or that all classes share it in equal intensity. There are the Moderates whose aspirations are summed up in the ideal of Colonial Self-Government which Mr. Gokhale formulated ; and though they do not formulate the stages by which they are to reach their political

destination, it may be accepted that they, or some of them at least, are no less sensible than Mr. Morley or the Anglo-Indian hierarchy of the need of gradation. But I am not far wrong, I believe, in asserting that till that sober and patient politician, Mr. Gokhale, formulated this idea of expansion within the Empire, there were in evidence in the Congress camp only crude, undefined, and often conflicting aspirations. The fluent but unsubstantial pathos of Mr. Banerji's long drawn eloquence, the vehement and senile insistence of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's denunciations, and Sir Pherozeshah's spicy oratory, coupled even with the thousand-and-one resolutions of twenty sessions of the Congress, failed to give one a clear idea of what was needed as a general remedy, though they created a vague sense of universal suffering and made audible the resonance of more or less unmusical sounds where all spoke and few cared to hear. I would go further and say that it is not Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal who has created the Extremists, but—paradoxical as it may seem,—it is that First Moderate, Mr. Gopal Krishna Gokhale. For, Extremism and Moderation are only the results of comparison. Before the standard of comparison was discovered there could be no Moderates and no Extremists. It is only the self-evident contrast that Mr. Gokhale's precision has made possible which makes us regard Messrs. Pal and Tilak as the apostles of Extremism. In reality, however, the other Moderates of to-day are the Extremists of yesterday, and it is an amusing irony of fate that the crown of martyrdom in the country's cause is robbed from Messrs. Banerji and Naoroji and placed on the brows of Lala Lajpat Rai and Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal. The ill-defined discontent and exaggerated complaints of the pioneers of patriotism during the last quarter of a century bred in the minds of their disciples, not the hope that the sluggish conscience of Britain would be awakened some day, but the hasty desperation that nothing could be hoped for from a foreign race, every individual of which had but one sinister motive,—the maintenance of India in a soul-crushing servility, and the exploitation of her resources for selfish ends. Those who quarrel with Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal's extreme views, and Lala Lajpat Rai's passionate outbursts, or the

political attitude of Mr. Tilak, must also admire their stern but precise logic. The premises have continuously been supplied by the Moderates for a quarter of a century. They are for the first time taken to be literally true, and pushed by the Extremists to their logical conclusion.

Barring Mr. Gokhale and a few of his intimate friends and followers, the Moderates are even now not so far removed from the Extremists as to be considered distinct in kind. They occasionally deprecate, in as moderate a manner as possible, the desperation of Messrs. Pal and Tilak ; but never have they firmly and clearly disowned the premises of their own suggestion, if not creation, nor even the only conclusion which those premises clearly indicated. They are the prototype of "Atticus" in the polished satire of Pope, for the too

> Damn with faint praise, assent with civil leer,
> And without sneering teach the rest to sneer.
> Willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike,
> Just hint a fault, and hesitate dislike.

In fact, the disguise of their attitude is not half so subtle. If, then, to-day, the Government should regard them, as Pope regarded "Atticus", "a timorous foe and a suspicious friend", it will not be more convincing to take up the attitude of injured innocence, and to place their hands upon their hearts swearing unswerving loyalty, or take affidavits that "of all the Indian population the Muslims are not—as they are often represented to be,—the only friends of Governments." Poses and protestations are like unconvincing.

But when we examine the rank and file of the Congress, it is apparent that they regard both the Moderates and the Extremists alike deserving of their support, with just a sneaking preference for the latter. As Mr. Gokhale said of Lala Lajpat Rai's opinions, they regard the two sets of views as a mere matter of temperament. They shout "jai" to all alike, and in their heart of hearts believe that every man who opposes the Government—even the rank sedition-monger,—serves a pur-

pose in the polity of the coming Nation. To them it is a "toss up" between Mr. Gokhale and Mr. Pal.

Well, the past cannot be lived over again. But the future is still before us. Would the Congressmen, or would they not, announce clearly and firmly their real views, and, what is more important, not compromise themselves by suspicious behaviour ? I would put it to the Moderates, that if instead of this being the year of grace 1907, it were the year 1857, with Martial Law's sure and sudden and often mistaken justice, would they remain as passive in their loyalty as they are to-day ? An Indian who figured largely before the public eye recently is deported without any trial or chance of explanation. If the right of public trial before a court of law is worth preserving, if the sense of security we enjoy to-day is worth retaining, it is surely worth it at the price of a little more precision in our political views. To eat our cake and wish to have it too is not possible, and the secret of a double existence is bound to leak out.

But when I have said so far I have not ended. It would be grossly unfair to India, and the educated Indians, to ignore the reality of their grievances. If the Indian Moderates and the Indian Extremists have sinned, they have sinned in excellent European company. For, if the Europeans have their Gokhales, they are not without their Pals.

Anglo-Indian Parties

Among the Anglo-Indians too there are two parties answering to the Moderates and the Extremists of the Congress. The latter are, however, mostly composed of those who have now either a distant connection or none at all with the "Home" of speaking of which they never seem to tire ; and in some cases, of men whose intellectual qualifications have enabled them to compete successfully for the I.C.S., but who lack social and other gifts that no texts-books can offer, and no examinations can test, but which are all the same needed in the governance of an alien population in many matters more sensitive than other races. They are the proud exponents of the "D n

Nigger School". In their estimation every concession made to the people is a sign of weakness incompatible with the glory of the imperial race of rulers to which they belong. Though often bound by official discipline to bow before the decision of the higher authorities, they have been the loudest in condemning, only a little while ago, the sober policies of Mr. Morely and Lord Minto. It is not without some amusement, coupled with instruction, to speculate what would have been the views of this school about the Secretary of State and the Viceroy, in the place of the lavish praise now offered, had not the Regulation of 1818 been brought into requisition. At any rate, the change of attitude is as sudden as any quick change artist could accomplish. If the sensationalism of their apprehensions could be believed, it would appear that these good people slept with a revolver under their pillow. Liable to scares, whether cholera be the cause or mango-tree daubing, they would like to issue ball cartridges to the troops twice a year to suppress another Mutiny. To them the reorganization scheme of Lord Kitchener would therefore appear to be a serious mistake. Trusting none, they are trusted by nobody. Yet we who live in this country, and know it as no European has known it since the Mutiny, have never come across the *chapatis* which we are asked to believe are being distributed again, nor seen the fanatic whetting the assassin's knife on the tombstone of the national martyr. Like Macbeth's, these are but dangers of the mind,—the false creations of a heat-oppressed brain.

One would think that these repressionists and suppressionists would be disowned by the large school of Moderates, and ridiculed as idle talkers. Yet nowhere do we come across a clear denunciation of these men by the soberer section of Anglo-Indian society. To a hundred that would suggest the prosecution of Indian agitators under section 124-A., not one suggests the prosecution of a European mischief-monger under Section 153-A. When a Viceroy deals firmly with prejudiced juries, or a Commander-in-Chief makes a righteous announcement against the reckless kicking of somnolent coolies, even

the Moderates get a little disconcerted. At Delhi, when the 12th Lancers passed the Viceroy's guests, these upholders of British *izzat* cheered lustily, forgetful even of the good manners required of them as guests of the central figure ot the Durbar. Indeed, it is a hard choice between English bigotry and Indian prejudice.

"Never the Twain Shall Meet"

That certainly is a Moderate party among the Anglo-Indians, but it deliberately believes much that the other party only babbles thoughtlessly. It regards the Indian and the Asiatic incapable of developing the White man's independence, or moral texture. The Indian clay is a hopelessly unsuitable material wherewith to mould a perfect man. One of these wrote from Simla to a London daily paper, not many weeks ago, *apropos* of the expectations of the Indians from Mr. Morley : "To admit the Asiatic otherwise than in the comparatively subordinate, though also extremely numerous, and often well-paid positions he already occupies, is to dilute efficiency with a stream that will force ever wider a once open penstock, until an overwhelming flood sweeps in." The *Spectator* tells us frankly that "the Whites claim— and have for a century exacted,- the position of an aristocracy among races of other colours. The White man, in an Asiatic state, never accepts any other position than that of first, and that by right not of his creed, not even of his knowledge, but of some inherent and—as it were—divinely granted superiority. He never consents to any lower position, and is in fact unable even to think of himself in any other." The writer admits that Japan has freed herself from the shackles of Asiatic conservatism, and is creating in Asiatic thought a marvellous revolution. But he uses the favourite and flattering fallacy of many European writers about Japan, that she is an imitator, or at best, a borrower of Europe, without initiative or originality. Even if this be granted, may it not be said that that excellent model is still extant for others to copy, and that the resources of the rich lender have not yet been exhausted even after the enor-

mous loan of Japan ? "Japan is not at heart an Asiatic Power," says the *Spectator*. Yet this was a heresy unthinkable twenty-five years ago. May it not be that other inconceivable heterodoxies are fast developing into faith ? Another writer, in the *Daily Mail*, writes an article full of brilliant paradoxes and scintillating with specious epigrams. He mocks the Frenchman who would apply the principles of 1789 to the Congo, and the American who has dumped upon the Filipions the paraphernalia of democracy. He reveals in the judicious indifference of the British citizen towards India and Egypt, and condemns the unpolitic curiosity which would convert the supremacy of the House of Commons over the alien dependencies from a necessary fiction into an inquisitorial fact.

The text of his lay sermon is the waxing fate of Jeshurun, who kicked—and lightly steemed—the rock of his salvation.

All this that is said in so many words was tersely put by Kipling into a single line—

East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet,

which, from being the wit of one, has now come to be the wisdom of many. But it is just this preconceived notion of the overlasting difference between East and West that is responsible for three-fourths of the discontent not only in India, but also in Egypt and China ; and, if ever the Yellow Peril or the Black Peril becomes a reality, in the sense of a combined effort in Asia and Africa to throw back the tide of European aggression, Europe would have none to thank but the narrowness of its own pseudo-scientific dogmas, just as France had to thank Napoleon as the maker of modern Germany, and the ultimate cause of the catastrophe of Sedan.

The Education Bacillus

If England really desired to create a gigantic and all-pervading monopoly in administrative, and still more so, in social distinctions, it made the initial mistake—as some Anglo-Indians

now openly declare,—of educating the Indians. The Brahman, a born monopolist, was wiser in keeping the sacred Vedas safe from the sacrilegious touch of the Sudra. That generous impulse which first created colleges and established schools was the real germ of the evil. Yet no bacteriologist discovered the dangerous bacillus early enough, and now no effort, however disguised under the cloak of educational theories, would repair the damage already done, or destroy the spawnlike progeny of that one praiseworthy mistake. It is true there is a pressing need of improving the character of modern education in India very much on the lines of Lord Curzon's reforms. Through lack of social intercourse between the teachers and the taught, due to the aloofness of the Europeans, coupled with the caste restrictions of the Hindus which have made residential colleges and schools impossible, the development of education has been one-sided, leaving the formation of character not to the force of living example, but to the printed precept, and encouraging the cramming of books at the expense of the growth of thought. In consequence of the early mistakes of the educationalists, the students have remained ignorant of the motives of their foreign teachers, and generally credit them with the worst. Their minds are immature, and, having been kept carefully wrapped up in a sort of political cotton-wool to prevent their catching a seditious cold, they fall the readiest victims to the first demagogue who addresses them on political topics. "This even-handed justice commends the ingredients of our poisoned chalice to our own lips." Thus, education, carried on on wrong lines, "returns to plague the inventor," But in spite of all these defects, it is this education itself through which Jeshurun hath waxen fat and grown thick. This is the irony of political destiny to which Lord Cromer alluded in his last report. There is no question of gratitude. Are young nations that learn their political lesson from older nations ever grateful? Japan stands to-day as a living example of ingratitude. In reality, it is the old problem which civilization and enlightenment, liberally diffused, are inevitably bound to raise up against themselves. England must now cheerfully pay the penalty of her generous impulses.

If the Indians do not acquiesce in a definition of the East which presupposes the loss of the decalogue this side of Suez, it is the amour-propre which their education has taught them that is to blame. By accepting as correct and unchangeable this line of demarcation between East and West, we lose at one stroke the thousand and one hopes and ambitions that vitalize our youth and manhood. Are we to surrender without protesting all that makes life worth living, simply because fanciful theories of the future destinies of races, propounded by those whose interest it is to convince us of them, assign to us no other position in life but that of hewers of wood and drawers of water ? Is not this the old world fatalism, the acceptance of blind *kismet*,—that *cul de sac* of Destiny—which Europe has hitherto regarded as our bane ? We, who do not accept this latest version of an old story, but believe that man is man and master of his fate, prove thereby how well we have learnt at least one lesson from Europe. The Brahman of old regarded his superiority over other castes as a divinely decreed postulate, and Europe laughed at him. Regardlesss of status, Islam proclaimed in a set of ideals of life the one straight road to heaven, and tolerant Christendom still mocks at it. And yet to-day we are calmly assured by these disbelievers in destiny and religious cosmopolites, that God has eternally placed a ban on the Torrid Zone, and excommunicated Asia for all time from participating in the truth of principles that govern man-kind in Europe. The Brahman at least made it possible for a man of lower birth to be born again as a Brahman. The Muslim was at his worst exclusive only so long as no change in ideals of life, signified by conversion, was assured, and thereafter absorbed the convert in his own community in the most thoroughgoing fashion. But does any forlorn theory of life contemplate our re-birth as Whites, and can the converted Ethiopian thereby change his skin ? It is curious, then to hear Lord Hugh Cecil wondering that so many years of missionary effort have not yet produced an Indian Bishop. The pseudo-scientists of Europe forget that their claims are only a little more irrational than those of the Brahman, and far less tenable than those of the One and Only Faith. It was not so

long ago that in an inspired moment the Londom *Times* wrote a leading article on Whites and non-Whites in which the colour theory was upset in a very forcible and convincing manner. Had Printing House Square not forgotten its own revelations, it would not have been necessary for the *Times* to assign the discontent wholly to factious agitation "which is sanctioned by no self-denial, which seeks its energizing forces in the development of race-hatred, and which relies for its success on the demoralization of the young, the coercion of the timid, and the boundless credulity of the ignorant." Lord Curzon never said a truer thing than this, that the unrest in India was only "skin deep," though His Lordship would not accept, perhaps, the interpretation which it can bear.

Self-Government

Once the European accepts the flattering assumption of his own political superiority, it is not difficult to trace the steps by which he arrives at conclusions repugnant to the Asiatic, and hotly challenged by him. He naturally regards the instruments which have raised him to this eminence as eternally unsuitable for the East, which is, *ex hypothesi*, incapable of political independence. Representative institutions which are the meat of Europe are the poison of Asia. Even if a concession is to be made to popular demands, it must be made to stifle clamour, as toys are given to crying children. Europeans have no belief in their efficacy this side of Suez. It is surprising to note how little they have now come to believe in the power of education, and how much in the inherited failings of humanity. With the pages of history unrolled before them, they yet fail to see that centuries are but ripples in the ocean of eternity. Did not earlier civilizations sneer equally arrogantly as those who were then regarded as barbarians, who yet humbled them, and like the fabled Phoenix, rose out of their ashes ?

It may not be remiss to remind the politicians, who regard representative institutions incompatible with the "genius of the East," that an eminent Indian, whom they have hitherto

delighted in honouring as a thinker and a leader of men, one who was not the immature product of our modern education, with crude half-formed ideas, but was familiar with both orders of things, the New and the Old, who had knowingly wrenched himself from the latter, and cut himself adrift from Old World moorings, in order to move with the new life-giving current, - Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, loyalist of loyalists, - had laid the blame of the Mutiny on those who had denied India direct representation in the Viceroy's Legislative Council, and asked for the extension of this principle in the politics of the Empire. When he was himself a member of this body, and the Central Provinces Self-Government Bill was being discussed, he said that he rejoiced to have lived long enough to see India learning at the hands of her rulers the lesson of self-government which had made Great Britain so great among the nations of the world. It would then be strange if this vital principle in politics is not now applied to India,—a quarter of a century after Sir Syed Ahmed's memorable speech in 1883,— simply because among the claimants of the boon are also some claimant Babus. Mr. Morley has dealt with the most critical situation, that, the Empire of Great Britain has had to face since the days of Burke and the American Taxation, and he has dealt with it in the genuinely liberal yet sober spirit of his great predecessor. An extension of the Legislative Councils in India, the creation of a Council of Notables, and the selection of one or two Indians for his own Council are steps evidently in the right direction, though little is yet known of even the most necessary details. It is not the pace that matters, so long as the ships' head is in the right direction. Is that direction to point towards efficiency, or Self-Government ?—that is the main question. Once that question is decided in an English spirit, the pace can be left to take care of itself ; and in reality, a slow pace is the only one consistent with safety where the best of pilots must be diffident.

Not Councils but Clubs

But it is not the political torpor, which the divine right to rule the non-Whites induces, that is the chief subject of com-

plaint. It is not the political monopoly that is the most oppressive, or most widely felt. Only an infinitesimal proportion of the vast population of this peninsula can gain for ages to come from the political or administrative expansion, and it is the generosity of England that has created the enhancing dreams, the high hopes, and the vitalizing ambitions of self-government. Political privileges alone will not allay the discontent. Even if there was a majority of Indians in the Legislative Councils, and a far larger admixture of the Indian element in the administration of the country, the unrest in its one dangerous form would still be there. Like the "smile *without* the cat" which Alice saw in Wonderland, the problem would still stare us in the face. For, India's problem is neither solely nor mainly political. Political expansion can wait ; participation in administration may be ushered in by degrees ; the drain to Europe may continue,—for the East is familiar with tributes to suzerains, and India may even thank Great Britain for disguising the humiliating tax in the one form peculiar to a "nation of shopkeepers". India has always been giving— and giving lavishly too,—to her conquerors. She is not good at accounts, nor picy in her dealings. But the reform that cannot wait but must come, now and to-day, the account in which India is exacting, and the drain which she cannot tolerate any longer, is the social one. Unprepared for unrestricted liberty, unqualified for absolute equality, India has always been ready and ripe for genuine fraternity. It is the denial of this, the holiest of the holy trinity, that has produced a bitterness foreign to India in her relations with her rulers. It may not be confessed,—and many men, and many communities dare not confess it in this free land,—but the bitterness is universal in India to-day. It is not talked of, but felt all the same, by high and low, educated and illiterate, by Muslim as well as Hindu, by the sturdy little Mahratta, no less than the stalwart Sikh, or the stately Rajput. We have all read the Maharaja of Bikaner's spirited, and—in the main—correct reply to the article in *Blackwoods' Magazine*. But could His Highness confess all that is in his heart with the courage of the old time Rajput, he could unfold a pretty tale of petty despotisms in

which the positions of scions of great houses of Rajputana and small political officers appear in an order the reverse of natural. Were it not for the social grievance, one would find more discontent in the Native States than in British India. With much less freedom, justice, impartiality in the matter of official patronage, and honesty and efficiency in the discharge of administrative duties, the Native States still possess that great desideratum of good government,—a strong sentiment of attachment to the rulers and their agents in administration. Let the British Government depose the worst ruler of such a State, there would still be genuine regret for the deposed tyrant, which could hardly be said concerning the departure of a most impartial District Officer who had ruled efficiently. We have often heard it and said that nothing appears to the Oriental like force. But force appeals to all those alike who are dependent upon stronger powers. In this the Oriental is not peculiar. What, however, do appeal to him in a pre-eminent degree are a kind word, and the satisfaction that those who rule over him are as accessible to him, and can be appealed to in his afflictions, whether domestic or public, as frankly and freely as the patriarch in the household. This it is which accounts for the subtle spell which the worst tyrant in an Eastern despotism can weave round the affections and sentiments of his subjects. If India is to be governed successfully in an autocratic manner, it is this magic web that must sedulously be woven. And for this no legislation is needed, nor agitation possible. "For Rome's expansion the Roman soldier was more needed than the Roman general," says the historian of imperial Rome. For India's peaceful progress it is not Cabinet Ministers that are needed, but Club men. The motto that most suits the present situation is, "*Not Councils, but Clubs*".

Noli Me Tangere

The Aga Khan has said that the discontent in India is not due to the social aloofness of the English. He would, in fact, deny the *noli me tangere* of the English in India altogether.

Well, there is a world of difference between the points of view from Olympus where the gods dwell, and the plains below where mere mortals drag on their dull existence. And though it is a distinct advantage, for a proper discussion of the subject, to have all doors open to you, it is also indispensable to have some slammed in your face. The following is what a European, writing to an Anglo-Indian daily paper, has to say: "To cure disaffection, what you have to do is to cultivate affection, and can it be honestly claimed that nine out of ten Europeans in India lift even a little finger in this direction? It is a standing problem where the courtesy of some otherwise well-bred Europeans goes as soon as they begin to have any dealings with Indians. I am convinced that one fruitful cause of Indian disaffection is European discourtesy." Of such discourtesy, every Indian could give instances numerous enough from his own experience, from the well-known story of the impotent potentate who shampooed a tired sportsman's legs in his own reserved railway carriage, down to less humiliating episodes. And it is not India alone that has to complain. All the bitterness rankling in the Egyptian's breast is due to the thoughtless and overbearing conduct of some Europeans, though they would assign to the same malady a different cause there, *viz.*, the fanaticism of the Pan-Islamite. Even the servile fellahin have shown that the worm can turn, for though their lot has undoubtedly improved during the British occupation, it was the fellah that was the villain of the piece in the melodrama at Denshawi.

But let us now turn from acts of positive discourtesy to forms of passive intolerance. From the European quarter and European club, down to European compartments in trains and European benches on station platforms, this unfortunate spirit is manifest everywhere. It is the boast of the English that they rule India as no ruling race has ever done before. But were it not for the Indian Press which is so often denounced, and the representative institutions which are declared to be incompatible with the "genius of the East," it would be impossible for the English to rule India in a sane manner.

Sir Syed Ahmed attributed the "Great Misunderstanding" of 1857 to the lack of direct representation of the Indian point of view. But the European in the Fifties had some knowledge of Indian feeling through the intercourse he carried on with his sable fellow-beings. And it was this which accounted for the hundreds of lives saved at tremendous personal risk by subordinates, acquaintances, neighbours, and domestic servants during that dark period. If there were to be a recrudescence of the same midsummer madness,—a thing which is happily now out of the question,—who can with any certainty say that similar risks would now be run to save a single life ? Now that the Suez Canal has decreased the distance between East and West, and every officer spends his three months' leave in Europe, when the jealous Mem Saheb. with the natural instinct of self-preservation has monopolised all the tender sentiments of the sterner sex of her own race, and forbids the bans in the case of all relationships with dusky beauties, when an Indian marrying a European girl would bring down on his own and his poor wife's devoted head all the accumulated indignation and fury of a gigantic racial Trust, it is to be doubted if a single European knows his India as it is necessary for a ruler to know the country over which he exercises a despotic sway.

A unique system of competition for the premier service of India demands encylopaedic cramming, if not encyclopaedic knowledge. But of its compatibility with the peculiar "genius of the East" any one can judge easily who knows that the District Officer for India is selected according to the same tests as the Cadet of Singapore, or the Clerk of the Land Office in Ireland. The I C.S. candidate has as much sympathy for India as for the Straits Settlements or Ireland, and, often with praiseworthy impartiality, he is at the same time a candidate for service in India, in the Colonies, and at Home. The East has no distinct call for him. There is, of course, a year's probation in England during which a little Indian history and an Indian vernacular is tried. But I doubt if any I.C.S. man knows half as much about the most important period of Indian

history as about the most obscure modern European or ancient Greek war ; and I have grave doubts about the existence of the man who could correctly ask for a glass of water in any Indian vernacular on the day of his landing in Bombay. It is this which accounts for the extreme poverty of literature of Indian history and Indian vernaculars from members of perhaps the most literary service in the world. All honour to the men, but the method of their selection deserves no commendation.

With such praiseworthy preparation for the career of a strenuous lifetime, is it any wonder that the Englishman in India remains out of touch with the land he rules in ? He takes his bearer and his wife's ayah to be authorities or polite speech in a land where some of the vernaculars, like Urdu, are the perfection of refinement, and a slight turn of expression would grievously offend a person whom we intend to charm with our urbanity. Would not the same fate befall an Indian who tried to grasp the beauties of Shelley or the subtleties of Browning, or mixed in Society in Belgravia, with the stock of knowledge the chief sources of the supply of which had been the maid-of-all-work from the somewhat democratic precincts of Whitechapel ? I am as much an admirer of Mr. Anstey's Jabberji English as any reader of *Punch*, but a much lesser humourist could split the sides of half the world with the solecisms of Anglo-India. Take Indian music. What is the accomplished Anglo-Indian's conception of that music ? A succession of quaint sounds, more or less inharmonious, producing a bizarre effect ! What does he know of Indian customs, even the prettiest of which are now, alas, doomed by the advance of a sombre civilization ? Hardly any is intelligible to him, and what is not easily comprehensible is readily catalogued as grotesquely superstitious, or barbarously quaint. Know his India ? Would an Indian know his England who could not distinguish Edna May's music from Melba's, nor tell Keats from Kipling, and who even in a short sojourn of three or four years remained ignorant of the esoteric significance of a kiss under the mistletoe ?

Reaping the Whirlwind

What is the result of all this intolerance and aloofness? The educated Indian has begun to hate the English; the half-educated zamindar flatters him; the ignorant peasant fears him. Of love, there is no sign or trace. Many Englishmen would declare that they do not need it. Yes, they may not need it to-day, nor tomorrow; but may the time be far off when reverses like those of the Transvaal war are met with in a trans-frontier campaign at the hands of a stronger opponent than the Boers? The existence of this vast and splendid Empire would then hang in the balance between the active support and passive resistance of the people whose love is despised to-day. Prestige, born of fear and pampered with flattery, would soon fade away, and the British forces would be but a drop in the bucket, between an advancing foe in front, and a disaffected subject population behind. The intoxication born of the heady wine of power and pride would go, leaving as a poor successor the nausea and the torpor of tardy regrets.

Let me not conjure up such a gloomy future. Look at the present itself. Every European who dies of plague is practically a victim to this racial pride. When the plague first broke out, the people attributed it to a benign and benevolent Government. An old woman asked the Municipal Secretary of an Upper India town, in sadly earnest accents, not to sprinkle any more red powder, as he had killed enough men in that quarter. Yet no Ajit Singh had persuaded her to believe this. A soda-water bottle, hung from a string into a well in a village where the Collector could not get ice on his tour, created an amusing uproar. Yet these are not proofs of Indian stupidity merely. They simply show that ninety-nine Indians out of every hundred do not understand an Englishman, and all, without any exception, fear him. The result is that he cannot induce those over whom he rules to do anything without force being evident in the background. Hence, also, the mortal horror of the separation of the Executive and the Judiciary. Repression with fear,—yes; but persuasion without understanding,—never. Is

it any wonder, then, that plague prevention failed in Bombay when the epidemic first commenced its ravages and could have been crushed ; that Indian subordinates and non-officials had to be requisitioned after all ; and that after the Malkowal blunder, aggravated by a secret inquiry, inoculation was doomed for a long time, and is far from popular even to-day ? Can it be said that any sanitary measures, no matter how stringent, adopted by an Indian Prince in a native State would awaken the same suspicions and provoke the same resentment that caused the plague riots in Bombay and Northern India ; and can those absurd stories about the poisoning of wells which we are told are the chief topics of conversation in the villages of the Punjab and the Frontier Province ever find credence among the subjects of the most backward Native State ? If not,— and there is nothing to make us believe to the contrary,—what constitutes the difference ? It is not that pride and suspicion on the one side have created prejudice and suspicion on the other ?

Moghal and British

Let us change the scene, and hear what an American has to say of the results of exculsiveness *apropos* of multi-millionaires in his own country. He compares the life of a Florentine banker of the Renaissance with that of a New York grandee. He contrasts the millionaire's mansion or hotel with the palace of the Medici filled with servants who were not treated as menials, and retainers who were in a sense members of the family, which the clerks and secretaries are not. This was a centre of social existence of which the prominent and always visible figure was the Croesus himself. His conclusion is that it is difficult to hate a man who tips his bonnet to you several times a week, while it is easy to loathe abstractly a magnate whom you have never seen, except through the blur of his possessions, and who can never by any chance see you. The drawback of class isolation is, from the point of view of the class itself, that the average man interprets the unknown, not in terms of magnificence or benignity, but of baseness. The

mysterious millionaire would lose much of his odiousness,—and justly,—if he ceased to be a myth, and came to be known as the human biped he actually is. If by any chance Mr. Rockefeller could be known on Grand Street as a Medici was on the Via della Vigna Nuova, the odds are that his ogreish glamour would promptly disappear.

Just substitute for the Medici the Moghal, and for Mr. Rockefeller an English official in India, and the conclusion would not have to be much modified. The Moghal Governor was equally the superior of the subject population of those days in culture and learning. He was even more autocratic than his English prototype, and, it is to be feared, even more regardless of the law of the land. No Habeas Corpus was then known, and the Regulation of 1818 was neither obsolete, nor needed any long-drawn justification. In fact, the Subadar ruled with an iron rod. But it was an iron rod which the local blacksmith had forged. His whole existence, with all its grandeur and glamour, its benevolence and oppressions, its indiscretions and follies, was passed almost in public gaze If the Subadar was not of the people, he was at least among them. Domestic events, bringing in their train joy or sorrow, met with a human response from the subjects.

Turn now to the English Governor, half of whose existence is passed on Olympian heights, where the uplifted gaze of mortality below cannot even penetrate the enveloping mists, and where only such may come from the plains as minister to his comforts and convenience. For all that they know of his loves at Jakko or his jealousies at Jutogh, the bracing joys of the god or his corroding cares, he may really be the serene and unmovable deity whom the fear-ridden worshipper in the plains below sometimes curses, sometimes implores, but at all times has to placate. When the dusty plains are visited, he comes to an expectant district like a comet, none knows whence, and goes away again like a comet, none knows whither. His whole life is an enigma. To many millions, his very existence is an unbelievable myth. The joys

and sorrows of his existence do not touch them. The one may mean a *bal masque* or an extra champagne dinner to a small exclusive world already satiated with gaiety. The other may mean to it a ball or a dinner put off—for another week. But the gladdest tidings and the most poignant grief do not draw from the millions a single smile or sigh. For, his joys are not the sable men's joys, nor his sorrows their sorrows. If some masterly hand, whether Royal or Vice-regal, could lift the curtain, the gods would perhaps sink into commonplace morals, in some cases possibly quite as vulgar and petty at heart, in spite of differences of surroundings, as the devotees themselves. But the loss of divinity would be more than compensated by the gain of humanity. With the disappearance of this splendid isolation, prejudice would vanish like the misty hosts at the break of the morning sun. Fears and suspicions would no more hamper the benevolence of the gods. They, perhaps, stand to gain the most from the change, for today many an honest man may be hating an entire class unreasonably, simply because he has never been in friendly relation with any of its individuals.

Last Words

We have seen that the present discontent is due partly, and inevitably, to the advance of Western education and enlightenment, aggravated by the blunders of the educationists, and extended and amplified by the active support of the Congress Extremists, and the contributory negligence of the Moderates. But it is also partly due to the actual discourtesy of some Europeans, and the social exclusiveness of all. An additional impetus is also given by the lavish promises of the English and their tardy performance. These pledges were not given by Machiavellian politicians as the Extremists would have us believe, but were the outcome of those generous impulses which a free people are bound to feel from time to time. When our politicians complain of the casuistical interpretations put upon the Queen's Proclamation by pro-Consuls and Parliaments, they are apt to forget that the most gracious

sentences were not the composition of some pettifogging lawyer, but of our Sovereign Lady, Victoria, who was every inch a woman and a queen. In fact, hardly any Indian patriot has rendered India such valuable services as Englishmen of the type of Burke and Bright, Macaulay and Bentinck. But all cannot take the wings of angels. Because the average Englishman lacks the fluffy growth on his shoulder blades, is it any reason to credit him with the cloven foot ? He is really and truly much more commonplace, being merely man.

It is true, however, that nobody in the wide world is half so sanctimonious as an Englishman. His insularity, added to his puritanic bent of mind, makes him an admirable hypocrite. What the French would cynically acknowledge and laugh over, and the Germans boastfully proclaim from housetops, the English would disguise with the most praise-worthy pertinacity. It is this trait of their character which makes alien nations suspect them of conscious hypocrisy. They feel annoyed if other people take them at their word. "We rule India for India's benefit only," says the Anglo-Indian. Yet no philanthropist was ever so persevering in doing good to others against their will. Every civilian talks of exile, and yet I fancy there is not a little regret when the would-be Governor is denied by the examiners the privileges of martyrdom and life-long exile. Such pugnacious altruism and persistent philanthropy are liable to be mis-understood, A little more self-introspection and cynical frankness could sweep away much of the prevailing discontent. A writer in the *Empire Review* from Johannesburg has put the case with true Colonial directness. "It is not today nor tomorrow," says he, "but the day will come when the Indians can justly claim they can rule themselves, and then we must cast aside hypocrisy, and either acknowledge we do not govern India merely for India's benefit, or we must retire. Self-interest in trade is why we rule India, and not pure philanthropy. It remains to be seen which we stand by."

If this were wholly true, and—what is more,—if the interests of India and England were to become contradictory

and mutually exclusive, there would, then, be ample justification for seditionists to do their work. For, sedition would then lose its stigma, and become a war of independence. The English would then have to say frankly : "Snatch, if you can, the club from the hand of Hercules," and deport all their disaffected subjects to another continent, or crush three hundred million malcontents. To hope to succeed by persuasion and reasoning would then be as futile as it would be treacherous.

But if that time has not yet come,—and I refuse to believe that it has come,—then, let the elect on the European side curb the petty passions of European Extremists, and let the Indian Moderates silence the rabid Radicals in their own camp, or disown them as courageously as they pronounce anathemas on Fullers and Curzons. The slow but sure method, however, of crushing disaffection is by courting affection. And for that there is no other royal road than that trod by the Afghan and the Moghal. Believe me, there is no greater Little Englander than your Imperialist. His seclusion behind a purdah that neither morality demands nor religion sanctions, and living in the midst of the people, yet avoiding the touch of a sixth of the whole human race, is a folly that would be amusing, did it not lead to a tragic end. Cannot Imperial Rome—with all her failings, truly imperial—teach the simple text of the Poet, "*Homo sum, nihil humani a me alienum puto*" ? Could but a few men at the top ponder deeply over the rejoicings of an Empire Day in which but a small slice of this gigantic Empire participated, there would be food enough for thought, and hope enough for the Empire's permanence and prosperity.

II

JUSTICE TO ISLAM AND TURKEY

The resolution that I have the honour to place before you this evening is :

"That this meeting urges upon the Government the necessity for taking into serious consideration, in the Turkish

settlement, the religious obligations of the Muslims (who in India alone number some 70 million citizens of the British Empire) and the national sentiment of United India."

Before I say anything about the claims that we have come to present, not only to the British and Allied Governments, but to the nations of Europe and America, I should like to make one point clear. And it is this—that we are not Turks. Whether the Turks be good people or bad people, whether they are gentle and humane, as all who have known them say, or murderers of women and children and massacrers, as has been alleged fairly frequently, they are, technically at any rate, the King's enemies. But we are British Indians, fellow-citizens of yours and as good subjects as you are of the King-Emperor. When the Turks come they will present a case to the Allies. I hope they will present the case well, and I hope they will succeed in presenting their case. But the case we have got to present is not the case of aliens or enemies, but the case of members of this Empire. I am glad that in the resolution the word "citizen" is used. To tell you the truth, I have been quite content to call myself a subject- (Mr. Lansbury and the audience: "No, a citizen"). However, I present the case today from the eminence of British citizenship, which I can only feel just a little bit when I am here, and not at all in my own country, where I can be interned or imprisoned without charge or trial, and nobody any the wiser, and where it is rather difficult for me to remember that I am as much a citizen as Mr. Lansbury. For if he is sent to prison, for which I am sure he has qualified himself—the people would soon know the reason why by a few questions asked in the House of Commons—one of our friends here (Colonel Wedgwood) would probably have an all-night sitting—and even if the House of Commons proved as impotent as it sometimes is in these democratic days of Coalitions and Coupons—the good people of the Labour Party would see to it that by some sort of action, direct or indirect, I can't tell which—the right of British Citizenship was not denied to Mr. Lansbury.

Now, what is our case ? We are told in the "Times" and other newspapers that the Muslims of India must not dictate the foreign policy of the British Government. Well, ladies and gentlemen, in our wildest dreams it certainly did not occur to us to dictate the foreign policy of the British Government. I wish we could even dictate the internal policy of the Government in connection with India. If this is an Empire (I should like to call it a Commonwealth) in which we are equal partners, as we are very often told we are, and it was certainly demanded of us to be equal partners when sacrifices had got to be made—and at that time we in India neither stinted money nor men—well, then, when the war is over, when the captains and the kings have departed--particularly the kings, for only one or two are now left-- when poor, common people, no better than us Indians and people of that sort, very common people, not autocrats and aristocrats, but mere democrats, have assembled to make peace--then I want to know what position I, whose people have given their men and money, have in the making of the peace. If you, ladies and gentlemen, who are of British birth and Christian faith, do not like your policy to be dictated to you by black heathens of the East, then I say we also do not want the foreign policy of *our* Empire to be dictated to us by a tiny fraction of forty-five millions of people of British birth and Christian faith.

If you desire to have a Commonwealth, well and good. If you want the old-fashioned Empire, well and good, though not so well and good ; but in any case it is not little Englanders who call themselves Imperialists that are going to lay down the policy of the British Empire. We, who number three hundred and fifteen millions in an Empire of four hundred and fifteen millions, should, I say, have some kind of voice, if not the prepondering voice, in the making of peace, though we had none in the making of a war which, nevertheless, we were called upon to wage.

Apart from that consideration there is another. In this it is not a question of citizenship. but purely a question of sub-

jection, but of a subjection that is and has always been strictly conditional. When the Queen of England, in the days of my grandfather, took into her hands the reins of office in India, and began to rule over the territories of the East India Company, a trading company which had become a sovereign power entirely against its will, after passing numerous self-denying ordinances—well, when the reins of Government in these territories passed into the hands of the Queen, a proclamation was issued that did her credit and did your people credit. It was a noble one and we have always believed in it. The most important thing that document contained was that no matter what changes should take place, one thing would remain unchanged—our religious obligations would be respected Ladies and gentlemen, we have given you whatever you needed, we were certainly not "picy" and never stinted money. In fact we have been spendthrifts perhaps, and squandered what wealth was left to us after having squandered away an Empire; but whatever we may or may not have thrown away, one thing was dear to us and that was faith—and it was understood that it was to be in all circumstances respected by the British. You may have had your Catholic disabilities and your Jewish disabilities. But we were assured that within the Indian Empire you had removed the disabilities of the Indians. They could claim to have free consciences, and it was clearly on the basis that our faith would be entirely respected that we consented to accept the rule of the Queen.

It may have been that we were too powerless at the time to have stopped you from exercising religious tyranny over the country, you with your powerful guns, ships and weapons of destruction : it may have been that we would have been entirely powerless to stop you even if you had chosen not to respect our faith ; but whatever the situation, it is a fact that in the name of Great Britain the Queen gave us the charter of our religious liberties, and gave us the pledge that our religious obligations would be entirely respected. That was the price of our allegiance to the Queen of Great Britain. Today, when the

Muslims are called upon to disregard their religious obligations, it is clearly because of that charter that Indians have a right to say "this shall not be." They will have to go, not only to His Majesty, the successor of Queen Victoria, not only to 10, Downing Street, where Mr. Lloyd George now lives, and hopes to live for ever and ever, they will have to go to every British man and woman who has drawn the least benefit from British rule over India, and tell them that they cannot possibly ask them to disregard their religious obligations without the most palpable breach of faith with more than three hundred millions of people.

If the religious claims of the Indian Muslims, which were to them solemn obligations, were now to be ignored, the pledge contained in the noble Proclamation of 1858 would be broken. You may, if you choose, question our claims and examine whether the preservation of the Khilafat, with adequate temporal power for the defence of the faith, and the maintenance of exclusive Muslim control over Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia, are duties imposed by Islam on every Muslim or not. But once they are acknowledged to be so, as they must be, then you cannot thereafter say we must dismember the Khilafat and demand a mandate in Mesopotamia and still expect from us the same loyal allegiance. This cannot and shall not be.

In the House of Commons the hero of Paisley, fresh from his triumph, in the very first debate that he could start on the subject after his election, talked of the connection of the Khilafat and Constantinople as being a fairly modern matter, and maintained that the Sultan as Khalifa has not been there more than four hundred years. Well, that is still 300 years longer than the rule of English kings and queens in India, but I will come to that by and by. Well, Mr. Asquith wanted to "Vaticanise" the Khalifa. But the Khalifa, as even Mr. Lloyd George could now tell him, was not the Pope, and the moment he would consent to be "Vaticanised," he would cease to be the Khalifa. He was the Commander of the Faithful, the President of our Theocratic Commonwealth, the Leader of all

Muslims in peace and war, though he could neither claim to be infallible like the Pope, nor could he in all circumstances exercise unquestioned authority, for Allah was the only Sovereign, and in case of dispute Muslims were bound to refer back to the Holy Quran and to the Traditions of the Prophet whose successor the Khalifa is.

But whatever he could or could not do, the Khalifa was certainly not a pious old gentleman, whose only function in life was to mumble his prayers and repeat his beads as Mr. Asquith clearly seems to think. If such is the ignorance of Mr. Asquith with regard to such fundamental doctrines of Islam, even after having been enlightened by our Delegation, then is it not a shame and a disgrace to one who has once been, and apparently still dreams of being once more, the Prime Minister of the Imperial Government of Great Britain ?

Having claimed to shape the destinies of three or four hundred million Indians, including over 70 million Muslims, if this is the extent of their knowledge, then I say it is a shame and a disgrace. Mr. Asquith said, no doubt, humorously that in these days even if a Khalifa goes to war he cannot hope to go to war with limited liabilities. Well, I will say this to him, that even in this twentieth century we are a very backward people in India, and if you will go to war with the Khalifa in order to oust him from the seat of the Khilafat, if you go to war with him in order to dismember his Empire, and if you go to war with him in order to step into the sanctuaries of our faith, because there is oil in Mosul, if you go to war with him because the sanctity of the Holy Land of Islam must be violated by exploiters demanding a mandate in Mesopotamia, no doubt in the sacred name of Self-Determination spelt with three letters, O—I—L—then even in these days you will have to go to war, I am afraid, with very limited assets indeed.

It is sometimes said, "The Turks waged war against us ; we fought them and we have defeated them, now we are going to treat them as defeated people. We have beaten the Turks

and must deal with them as we wish." This argument is all very fine, but who is "We" ? Who fought, and who won the war ? Who went to war in Mesopotamia ? Who went to war in the Holy Land ? India won Baghdad, and India and Muslims won the Holy Land. According to Mr. Lloyd George, the Allies are not dealing with the Turks differently from other defeated people. We are told there is nothing of the Christian and the crusading spirit in this matter. And yet, when proposing a gratuity for Lord Allenby he said : "The name of General Allenby will be ever renowned as that of the brilliant Commander who fought and won the last and most triumphant of the Crusades. It was his good fortune by his skill to bring to a glorious end an enterprise which absorbed the chivalry of Europe for centuries. We forget now that the military strength of Europe was concentrated for generations upon thi purpose in vain, and a British Army under the command of General Allenby achieved it finally." So there was after all something of the crusading spirit somewhere when General Allenby, in the words of Mr. Lloyd George himself, "won the last and most triumphant of the crusades." However, at the very time Lord Allenby was saying that two-thirds of his army in this crusade was composed of Muslims ; a wonderful crusade, in which the Crescent was fighting the battle of the Cross. But, anyhow, were not the co-religionists and compatriots of these strange Crusaders who repudiated the Cross and yet fought the Crescent, entitled to demand that the religious obligations of the Muslims and the overwhelming national sentiment of India should be considered in the Turkish settlement ?

Whatever the Indian soldiers have done, this I will say about them I have seen them ; we had always avoided contact with them in deference to official susceptibilities—but when we came out of gaol these people have rushed to us like the rest of their countrymen ; they have kissed our hands, embraced us, shown to us in an unmistakable manner that if you demanded from them, conscripted soldiers as they almost were, that they should go against their own religious obligations, they have unmistakably shown to us that day you will be using a weapon which will break in your hands.

Therefore, although I do not threaten, although we have not come here to threaten you, it ought to be made clear to you that the situation is now different. Today it is not only the Muslims who feel like this, but the Hindus, and even the Sikhs—after Amritsar. India today is one and united. That is why in our resolution we have asked the Government to show respect not only for Muslims obligations, but also for the national sentiment of United India. How is this sentiment expressing itself? On the 17th October last the Muslims observed the Khilafat Day, a day on which the Muslims suspended business and fasted and prayed, and many Hindus joined them. Now on the 19th March, precisely the day that we were being received in 10, Downing Street by Mr. Lloyd George, from one end of India to another there was a total suspension of business, in which not only Muslims and Hindus and Sikhs, but Parsees and others also participated. In order to realise what this suspension of business means, I will ask you not to think of a railway strike, nor even a general strike in England or in Germany ; you have got to think of the total suspension of business throughout the Continent of Europe. Yet, primitive as some of our people are, very impulsive as they seem to be, in spite of this universal demonstration, there was no violence. And this in spite of the existence of men who provoke violence. Yes, there is a class of people that excites violence. We have known people in India who are agents of violence, because if violence is provoked, in its early stages it might be crushed, and that might be used as an argument for "not making concessions to rebels." That is the old vicious circle in which people who want to keep power in their own hands try that the world should move. Oppression provokes disturbances and disturbances are used for perpetuating oppression and refusing reforms. After reading a good deal of the history of England at Oxford, I am not quite sure that three quarters of your constitution is not based on force or a show of force in the background. When King John gave the Magna Carta to the people of England, the great charter of your liberties, and I hope of ours too, in spite of some recent

decisions of the Privy Council—he did not do it absolutely out of love for the British people. Still less, when King Charles forfeited his head, he did not sign his death-warrant because he thought the best thing for him to do was to leave the world. The same sort of thing may be said of the conditions which prevailed in the days of King Charles the Second, who did not want to go on his travels again, and of James the Second, who did apparently want to go. In all these reforms, one after another, you always find this, that the people's liberties had to be either purchased when kings were in need of money for their wars or their amours—or there was force, or show of force, in the background. We in India, however, do not threaten you with force.

We are being led by a man who believes in soul-force. If throughout the world today there is anyone who tries to live up to the Sermon on the Mount—that sermon which is often overrated but at the same time always forgotten in the shaping of your foreign policy—if any man tries to live up to that sermon it is Mahatma Gandhi. He is not a Muslim. He is a Hindu of Hindus. Today he is leading the entire continent of India because he realised that in this matter the Muslims are not carrying on a "fictitious" and a "factitious" agitation, and he has carefully ascertained that they cannot possibly "moderate" the claims that they have put forward without being absolutely false to all the convictions that they have cherished for centuries. Time after time he had pressed us for an irreducible minimum of our claims. He has at last himself drawn up a manifesto, which we have brought with us as the mandate of the Indian Delegation. The claim put forward is a simple claim. It says that it is one of the fundamental doctrines of Islam, absolutely unalterable, that there should always be a Khalifa, and that the Khalifa should have temporal power at all times adequate for the defence of the Faith, and that is the measure of the irreducible minimum of temporal power.

Whatever you like to think about temporal power, I am convinced, and I think I can convince you easily enough, that

when you have people like Lord Bryce who want to use the argument of the "Big Stick," you will be bound to meet the Muslim demand for temporal power for the Khalifa. If, however, there is complete disarmament in Europe, the first person who will desire to bring his arms to the scrap-heap, or to turn them into ploughshares, will be the Muslim Khalifa himself.

The second claim is that the local centre of our Faith, the land known as the Island of Arabia, should be free from non-Islamic control in any shape or form. Arabia, to the European geographer, is a peninsula bounded only on three sides by water ; but to the Islamic religion it has always been an island. You will understand this when I tell you that it is surrounded on one side by the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, on another side by the Indian Ocean, on the third side by the Persian Gulf, and on the fourth by the waters of the Euphrates and the Tigris ; and on his deathbed our Prophet gave an injunction, binding on all sections of Muslims, that in that region no kind of non-Muslim control should be allowed.

But even if you disregard our religious requirements, what about your own political principles ? We have heard a great deal of the principle of self-determination, and now that we have seen some applications of this principle, we find that it has about as many interpretations as love or religion. There is one interpretation when the principle is applied to Ireland ; on this you are all well-informed, and I shall not waste your time. There is another interpretation of self-determination for Montenegro, when it is assured it is not good to be a cock's head when you can be a bull's tail. In spite of Montenegro's desire for independence, she is assured that it is better in her own interest to be part of a larger unit. When we ask that the Arabs should not be forced to get out of the larger unit we are told by Mr. Lloyd George : "Is the sacred principle of self-determination not to be applied to an Arab simply because he is a Muslim ?" But surely the last interpretation of self-determination is the best of all. We never knew that that large

mouthful of a word 'self-determination' could be spelt with three letters : O – I – L This is the latest interpretation of self-determination. But whatever Mr. Lloyd George may say, the people of Mesopotamia, as well as those of Syria and Palestine, have clearly determined that they will have no mandates and no protectorates.

Then we come to Constantinople, which has been very generously spared to the Khalifa, out of deference to Muslim wishes or to French wishes, I cannot tell which.

But did not Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Bonar Law, and Sir Edward Carson tell us that this had to be since there was no other alternative, and the late lamented and always lamentable Tsarist autocracy was no more ? And is it not because Mr. Lloyd George desires to keep the head of the Khalifa in chancery ? The Khalifa is to remain a hostage in the hands of the Powers, and we are to express our gratitude for it. This is an outrage which Islam will never tolerate. The Straits are to be taken out of Turkish control, and British guns are always to be trained on the Khalifa's palace. There was a time when Great Britain and France went to war with Russia on the side of Turkey, because Russia wanted the Straits to be open to her battle-fleet. Today there is no Russian battle-fleet, so you find that the Straits are to be opened and to be guarded by Russia's recent Allies, because the Turks "must not be able to slam the door in our face." Why should they not ? Do you not slam the door in the face of all comers in the harbour of Dover ? The present demand is just as though you were going to be asked to open the Yarmouth harbour to the German ships. What is going to happen is this : that the Straits of Dardanelles and Bosphorus will once more be closed to Russia, but this time by her Allies the British. The whole past history of this Straits business has been this : the Russian Black Sea fleet wanted to come out into the Mediterranean, and the Turks were asked to keep the door slammed in everybody's face. because the route to India should not be endangered. Today it is not the Russian Black Sea fleet that wants to come

out into the Mediterranean—it is the fleet of another Power that wants to get into the Black Sea to outflank Soviet Russia and to control the oil that comes from Baku to Batoum. Numerous little States, such as Azarbaijan, formerly parts of the Russian Empire, have been formed now, to guard for the Allied Powers the oil at Baku. Whether it Is oil, whether it is Bolshevism, that suggests this policy—whatever it is, the Muslims cannot permit that their Khalifa is to remain as a hostage. They claim that it is part of their Faith that the Khilafat should exist as an independent sovereignty, and its Empire should not be dismembered any further after the very great spoliation that had already taken place after the Balkan War. After that large spoliation, the Khalifa's Empire has really been reduced to such small proportions that they cannot allow the least little bit of Khilafat territory to be taken away from the Khalifa, and they must insist that in the Holy Lands, even in spite of oil, they would not have a British Protectorate, or French or American mandate.

They do not rule out political changes, and they say that if the Arabs genuinely desire self-government they should have it. If the Jews desire it they should have it. If the claim of the Jews is not for political sovereignty, but for economic freedom or for a cultural federation, it can be gladly recognised. Lastly, if the Armenians in so-called Armenia want self-government they should have self-government ; but they should not, being in a minority, be allowed to rule over the Muslims majority."

People in this country talk so much of the Armenian "massacres." I crossed over to France the other day, and although I talked with various classes of people, they never once mentioned to me those blessed words "Armenian massacres." It seems to me that the only people in love with the massacres are the British. What do we ask ? I do not treat the matter lightly. It is not a matter for jokes. A massacre is a massacre, and whoever indulges in it is a criminal, and a criminal should be punished. We, the Muslims of India,

do not care this much for the Turkish Empire, as such. We care for Islam. If the name of Islam is to be besmirched in this manner, then we want you to go to the spot and hold a careful enquiry. Mr. Lloyd George was asked to publish the Inter-Allied Commission's report about the massacres undoubtedly indulged in by Greek soldiers in Smyrna. They had no right to be there. Yet in the name of yourself and your Allies these people went there, according to the report of this Inter-Allied Commission, in the spirit of conquerors and crusaders, and perpetrated massacres and outrages of every sort. Nothing was published because Mr. Lloyd George said that the Greeks had not been heard in their defence, and even a Christian should not be punished before he is tried and found guilty. I do not know why he used that word "even," but I can equally well say even a Muslim should be tried before he is punished. There have been allegations against the Turks for a long time because the Tzars of Russia were anxious to make a corridor through Europe and Asia from Petrograd to Peshawar, and after the success of this massacre "stunt" in the Balkans and the liberation of Bulgaria, they tried the same sort of intrigue in Armenia. Nothing pleased the Russians so much as a massacre. Russia has gone the way of all tyrannical autocracies, but it has left this legacy of massacres behind.

What do Muslims ask ? They say : "Have an International Commission ! Allow the Muslims of India and Hindus to be represented on the Commission, and go into the whole question of massacrces before the war, during the war, and now. If the Turks are found guilty they should be punished. But if they are to be punished, equal punishment should be meted out to those who caused the tanks of Tripoli to be soaked with Arab blood." We demand that in the Balkans—the bones of Turks are still bleaching today on Balkan heights—we demand that the people who butchered women and children there in cold blood after unnameable outrages, should be punished. And we Indians have a right to demand that not only should it be the Italians and the Bulgarians and the Greeks, but even the British, the O'Dwyers and the Dyers who have dyed their hands with gore

(shame) and fired on innocent crowds assembled for lawful purposes on April 13 last year, we demand that they too should be punished.

But if you, Englishmen and women, are not prepared to do justice by your own people, then I say you have no right to talk of doing justice by the Turks, and to deal with this business of massacres. If you will use force to compel us to submit to a peace that contravenes Islamic religious requirements, and blood is shed for blood, then the guilt of blood will be yours, because you are prepared to use force, but you are not prepared to do justice to the Muslims.

This is what we have come to ask. I tell you this, we have not come to threaten, and we do not threaten you. My friend Mr. Wedgwood, in the House of Commons said, "You can get more out of English people by persuasion than by threats," and I believe him. But he says, "What can you threaten us with ?" Well, that is the worst part of the whole business. There is nothing at all after less than a hundred years of British rule that we can threaten you with. It is true, as Colonel Wedgwood asked, what can we threaten you with ? though the measure of our impotence, in spite of our righteous wrath today, is also the measure of the success of your crushing rule achieved in no more than a century. But having reduced us to this state of impotence, I ask you to consider this. If we want to threaten you, we obviously cannot threaten you with Howitzers and Dreadnoughts and Aeroplanes and Tanks ; but we possess a thing that is unconquerable : our determination to die true to our Faith. Money is being poured into the Fund for the Khilafat. But every Muslim who pays is told that this is not money ; it is only a draft on the life of every subscriber. We do not threaten to kill you ; but we do threaten you with our undying determination to die like kings of our consciences and masters of our souls.

III

CHALLENGE TO OUR LOVE OF FREEDOM

We have read Mahatma Gandhi's Presidential Address more than once, not because there is anything startlingly new

in it, or anything that was not clear enough on the very first reading. He has only one message for the nation, and that he gave when he called upon it to non-co-operate with this alien Government. Far from enlarging that message, he has, in fact, shortened it, because while consenting to, or rather recognising the fact of, the suspension of other items of Non-Co-operation as part of the national programme, he now calls upon the nation to concentrate on Hindu-Muslim unity, the removal of Untouchability and the production and use of Khaddar for the emancipation of India. We have read his Presidential Address more than once because after the first reading it failed to grip us. Like the athlete who would not permit an ounce of fat to encumber him without giving him additional strength, Mahatma Gandhi does not tolerate unnecessary rhetoric. He is to that extent an ascetic in his writing, just as he is to a great extent an ascetic in the matter of food and clothing, and in fact in his entire way of living. In writing his address he has practised this asceticism even more rigorously than is habitual with him, and over and above his usual economy of words there is apparent a deliberate restraint as regards the use of sentiment. But his address improves on acquaintance, and we would ask our readers to read it over and over again until it soaks into them and they realise what it is that the Mahatma means to convey to them.

Without using words suggestive of an ultimatum, he still presents to-day an ultimatum to the nation. We know how distressed the Mahatma was when the Associated Press converted his "helplessness," on hearing the details of the Kohat Tragedy, which induced him to undertake his hazardous fast of twenty-one days, into "hopelessness." He is the last man to lose hope, and nothing suggestive of despair would be a fitting title for the address he is delivering to-day at Belgaum ; otherwise we would have called it "A Forlorn Hope." But if it is not that, it is emphatically his challenge to our much-vaunted love of freedom. And if there is any Indian who claims that he has a true sense of his present slavery and hates his chains, then we are convinced he can have no alternative but to take

up this challenge, and to prove by the end of the year 1925, through his work on the lines recommended by Mahatma Gandhi, that he loved freedom like righteousness and hated slavery like iniquity.

Justification of Non-Co-operation

Mahatma Gandhi cannot offer a better justification of Non-Co-operation, which so many people foolishly think he is giving up, than by stating at the very outset of his address that "from the September of 1920 the Congress has been principally an institution for developing strength from within." It has certainly ceased to function by means of resolutions addressed to the Government for redress of grievances. These resolutions were nothing more than the petitions dictated by our weakness, unless, of course, we did not know that the real character of the existing system of Government was not beneficial. The party or parties in India that ask us to confine our activities to so-called constitutionalism, have no justification for such a slogan but that of a belief in the beneficial character of the present system. If they still believe in that, they are fully justified in passing resolutions for the redress of their grievances, and in expecting results from such a barren procedure. But Liberals like Mr. Shastri and Mr. Chintamani do not seem to believe in that beneficial character any more than Mahatma Gandhi or we ourselves. That is why we cannot understand their self-denying ordinance which confines their activities to the narrow circle of a Constitution which they did not frame, and which they cannot alter, but which their political opponents as well as ours have deliberately devised, and which they mean to maintain in all its narrowness as long as they can do it. The Swarajists do not swear by the Constitution that has been imposed upon them from the outside ; but they claim that they will take advantage of such opportunities as even this Constitution offers, of compelling the Government to come to terms with them and agree to make such a radical modification of it as would give us Swaraj. The only excuse that we can plead for them is that of self-deception. We maintain that the Government may be vexed by their obstruc-

tionist tactics, but it cannot be brought to its knees unless, in the words of Mahatma Gandhi, the nation develops strength from within. This it will not do by their sparring in the Councils with officials and with the latter's non-official supporters. The whole problem before the country is to devise means for the development of national strength from within, and the Mahatma's conclusion is that if there is any alternative to the use of the knife and the revolver and the bomb, it is Charkha, which alone makes it possible for us to boycott foreign cloth that impoverishes us, and, of course, the other boycotts the suspension of which by the nation the Mahatma has been forced to recognise. The Mahatma's message for 1925, then, is the message of the Charkha, and we beseech all India to understand its implications.

Non-violence

As all the world knows, and as even his opponents acknowledge, non-violence is the essential principle of Mahatma Gandhi's life and teachings; and he has always taught his countrymen that, even if they are not convinced that non-violence is the only proper creed, they should at least give up all thought of violence for political purposes adopt non-violence as their policy. We are among those that believe war to be a great evil; but we also believe that there are worse things than war, and that a nation's slavery is one of them. Ordinarily war must not be resorted to by ourselves; but when it is forced upon us by an enemy that believes in no other argument than that of force, we believe that we must not shrink from war, but must defend ourselves against him and use all the force we can command, force without stint and without cessation, till, in the language of the Quran, "war hath dropped her weapons" and peace and persuasion resume their sway over men's minds. We, however, entirely agree with Mahatma Gandhi that non-violence is the only proper policy for India to adopt to-day for her emancipation. We *can* achieve victory without violence. More than that, the use of violence for a nation of 320 million people should be a matter of

reproach to it. Finally, victory achieved with violence cannot but be the victory of the fighting classes. Swaraj, to be the *raj* of all, must have been won through the willing sacrifice of all. If this is not so, we shall have to depend for its maintenance as well on the prowess of the fighting classes, which we must not do. Swaraj must be won by the minimum sacrifice of the maximum number, and not by the maximum sacrifice of the minimum number. And, since we believe that the Charkha requires the minimum sacrifice of the maximum number, while the sword requires the maximum sacrifice of the minimum number, we have agreed that the nation should keep its sword, such as it is, sheathed, but must work its Charkha for all it is worth. Knowing the possibilities of the Charkha we do not hanker after violence, and this is our final answer to those who always love to misrepresent others when it serves their purpose. Now Mahatma Gandhi's standard of non-violence, to which he required all national volunteers at Ahmedabad in 1921 to pledge themselves, is a very high one; for he requires Indians to be non-violent not only in deed, but also in word, and even in thought and intent, According to this standard, only too many of his countrymen have failed during the last three years; but it is the success that he has achieved in his preaching which surprises us more than the violence of which we have had some exhibition. When the guilt of Chauri-Chaura and similar unfortunate occurrences is judged, it is necessary to take into consideration not only that which was done, but also that which had been resisted. Never before in the annals of India have the people felt as intensely as they have done since the dawn of Non-Co-operation, and the marvel is not that the fury of the mob has resulted in so much bloodshed, but that the manhood of India has been successfully revived with so little of it. We challenge any one to show another instance in the history of mankind where hundreds of millions of people have been roused to stand up for their liberties, and have remained peaceful as the people of India. There is no country in Europe with all its cold, frog blood that would not have experienced a deluge of blood in like circumstances. That India has escaped such a deluge is due to Mahatma Gandhi and to his fellow-workers.

The Mahatma embarrasses his followers and fellow-workers only too often with his sweeping and unqualified admissions. We are, however, glad that in his address he acknowledges that the propaganda of non-violence checked the outbreak of physical violence which would certainly have broken out had Non-violent Non-Co-operation not come into being. He is perhaps too hard when he says that the most important boycott demanded by the Non-Co-operation, namely, the boycott of violence, though it appeared to be at one time entirely successful, was non-violence that was only skin deep. It was certainly more than that ; and although it was to a great extent passive and born of helplessness, it was nevertheless genuine and effective as far as it went. And we disagree with him when he says that it was due to Non-Co-operation that there was an eruption of intolerance against those who did not cease to co-operate. Elsewhere he has said that Hindu-Muslim riots are the result of the imperfect Non-Co-operation of his followers. To us the truth rather seems to be that the people were in earnest, and had not acquired enough self-control to keep their intolerance of Non-Co-operators always in check. As regards Hindu-Muslim riots, we doubt if any of his followers have participated in them. It is true that some of those whose wranglings in the newspapers have been really at the bottom of many of these unfortunate occurrences, still claim to be his followers ; but these have only countenanced violence indirectly. They have not directly participated in it themselves.

In any case, what is necessary is that we should rigidly practise non-violence and set a better example to the masses than we have yet done. Our war even against the existing system of government must be a war without an enemy, and we should certainly practise far more tolerance towards each other, whether those opposed to us are No-Changers or Swarajists, and whether they are Hindus or Muslims. But we deprecate the fashion that there seems to be in some No-Changer circles of suggesting that the Swarajists are any more in love with violence than the No-Changers themselves. Nor

do we believe that there is likely to be any extraordinary re-crudescence of violence in India for political purposes. Our imperfect Non-Co-operation not having brought us Swaraj, the impatient who had resorted to violence before but had given it up on the commencement of Non-violent Non-Co-operation, may naturally be inclined to resort to violence once more, though we can expect no better results from such violence to-day than were obtained in the past. Violence requires courage, however much we may characterise crimes of violence as cowardly, and there is no evidence of any great access of courage to-day among Indians to warrant us to expect greater resort to violence on the part of the politically-minded people in India. The fact is that at Bardoli the Mahatma asked us to drop violence ; but fear even of the consequences of Non-violent Non-Co-operation and its discomforts and inconveni-ences made us drop Non-Co-operation instead. This is our own reading of the situation as distinct from the Mahatma's : nevertheless we do think that the resentment which is certain to be generated by otherwise unproductive and sterile debates in the legislatures will not help us in the creation of that atmosphere which we need for the universalisation of the Charkha. And if the Swarajists do not give up Council-work, which we certainly do not expect them to do at this stage, it is all the more necessary for them to emphasise that they think that violence will only retard progress and not accelerate it. We do not, however, wish to preach perfection to them ; and in the matter of non-violence we do not consider their leaders like Messrs. Nehru and Dass stand in need of any No-Changer's advice. But we would ask their Marathi-speaking conferers, whose unwillingness to spin is well known, to con-sider most carefully the proposition that the Charkha is the only possible substitute for the knife and the revolver and the bomb. We can understand if they think that by opposing the bureaucracy in the Councils, and forcing it to come out into the open as force naked and unashamed, they will pro-duce enough excitement in the country to increase the forces of violence and give the believers in violence a better chance. But if, like us, they have given up all thought of India's emanci-

pation through violence and they also think that at any rate in her present state such enterprises are doomed to failure and would only retard our progress, then they must consider what good their Council wranglines are expected to do. and how they can thereby develop the nation's strength from within.

The Charkha

In our issue of the 28th November we have discussed at sufficient length the economic drain due to the use of foreign cloth, and the improvement of our peasantry, the life of which, since there is no *Charkha* now in the peasant's cottage, is a long-drawn question between a crop and a crop. We have shown how on that peasantry, in the last resort, not only we, but the Swarajists also, rely ; and we hope we have proved that the only cure for its economic debility is its employment in the slack season af agriculture in the production of khaddar. As foreign cloth is by for our largest import, and as most of it comes from Great Britain herself, the production of khaddar by our peasantry will not only cure its own economic debility, but will also restore the economic equilibrium of the country at large, and will at the same time affect the nation that is keeping us in such slavish subjection to itself. What other weapon, we ask, can do all these things at one and the same time ? But the peasantry is most unlikely to take to the Charkha once more in large enough numbers after all these years, unless it is assured by the patronage of the classes of ready sale for its produce, and unless we advertise this cure of its debility by taking a little of it ourselves. If we had Swaraj already, and could shut our foreign cloth by means of the tariff, which is an exercise of economic compulsion, we could assure the khaddar producers in the cottages that a good market existed for their wares ; but even then we doubt if we could induce the cottager to produce khaddar and have the supply ready by artificially creating for it a demand in the country. In any case, we have not yet got Swaraj, and khaddar we are discussing just at present as a means to the

attainment of that end, and not as an end in itself. We are, therefore, reduced to the single alternative of the classes spinning in order to induce the masses to produce khaddar.

Figures have often been published to prove two things. One of them is that the mills by themselves cannot shut out all foreign cloth, even if they can help us—which obviously they cannot—in distributing wealth among the peasants, and thus curing their economic debility. The next thing that these figures go to prove is that khaddar together with mill-cloth will suffice to close the door of India on foreign cloth. Obviously then we cannot do without the production of khaddar, and without the spinning of the classes as an inducement to the masses to produce it. The Mahatma's acceptance of the Presidentship of the Congress and his exposition in his address of what he desires and hopes is, therefore, nothing short of what we have called it—a challenge to every Indian's claim that he loves his country and the freedom of his country.

He deals sufficiently and exhaustively, though as usual extremely briefly, with the objections of the critics, and it is not necessary to repeat what he has said. To his observation with regard to the criticism that the spinning-wheel is not exciting enough, "for the millions solid work itself is an excitement and tonic at the same time," we would only add that things even duller and more insipid than the Charkha would be more exciting than the strongest of strong drinks to one who only understood that they provided the one chance of freedom that remained for him and his nation of 320 millions ! We ask if there is one lover of excitement in India, be he gambler, be he imbiber of spirituous liquors, whom the biggest stakes and the fieriest portions now fail to excite, who will not find the new excitement he needs for his jaded being in a thing that has some chance, where none other exists, of breaking the chains of a nation that constitutes a fifth of the whole of humanity ?

We believe the Charkha has this chance, and we want the whole of India to become Charkha-mad during the year of the Mahatma's Presidentship. And if those of the Swarajists who are not unwilling to spin can help us, while doing their own Council-work undisturbed, to spread the infection of Charkha-madness all over the country, then we think the agreement which the Mahatma has signed at Calcutta, and for the acceptance of which he pleads in his address, will be amply justified. But if a party proud of its discipline just secures from a majority of its members who are unwilling to spin twenty-four thousand yards each of handspun yarn purchased from the bazaar, to enable them to take part in the Congress voting, even if a minority of its members contributes yarn of its own spinning, then, we fear, the document signed at Calcutta would be a scrap of paper of less value than the paper itself. But even in that case we shall ourselves remain Charkha-mad, and we want to urge every No-Changer to go on as if the Swarajists did not exist, and to try to infect the whole of the country with his own Charkha-madness. He must go in blinkers, entirely disregarding what the Swarajists are doing and what they are not doing, only looking ahead at the goal, which must be to make by the end of his Chief's term of office the boycott of foreign cloth very nearly, if not entirely, complete. It will not do for him to tarry any longer by the roadside, waiting for fellow-workers unwilling to continue the journey, or wasting his time in idle reproaches. He must be a fanatic for whom at least there is no limited liability; and without permitting the least partisanship or malice to cross his path, he must co-operate with all other fanatics equally Charkha-mad to assist Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress in the execution of the national programme outlined at Belgaum. No one could then have any quarrel with a Society of "Fanatics Unlimited" such as we have suggested; and yet it would be the spearhead of the Congress for pushing through with its main purpose. There is little indication in the Mahatma's address of such madness as we desire to produce; but in the rigid restraint he has exercised over himself in the language of his address, to which we have already alluded, and

in the character of the agreement itself into which he entered at Calcutta, there is sufficient indication to us and to many others who know him of the fires that are melting the lava under the crust of the rigid and cold earth. If there was any doubt on the subject, it must have been cleared the other day when the Mahatma gave ample opportunity to all sceptics among No-Changers to express and to resolve their doubts, and ended up with warning those who pledged themselves to work his Charkha programme, that he was a relentless and inexorable leader who could spare no pity for those who would, while on the march, fall out of the ranks, footsore and weary and disinclined to proceed any further.

We ask our readers to consider carefully what it is that the Mahatma is proposing. He is that rare being, a visionary, who is at the same time a thoroughly practical person, the most large-hearted man in the world to-day, and one who is also among the top most men of the world in intellectual greatness. He deliberately tells three hundred and twenty millions of his countrymen that their one chance of freedom is the fullest possible use of the Charkha by all classes of Indians ; and the highest political body in the country has deliberately and with eyes open imposed upon him the burden of leading it at this critical juncture. Can any same man think anything else but that those who have imposed this burden upon him mean to offer him their fullest and most steadfast support ? He frankly tells everyone that if the Charkha does not appeal to his head as well as to his heart, he will be warning in his duty in not rejecting his lead. He tells his people that they would be justified in regarding him as a hindrance to national progress if they consider him to be wrong in his exposition of the doctrine underlying the spinning-wheel. What, we ask, must the world think of people that do not reject his lead after this, but act as if they accepted it and, yet fail to be infected with his own madness, and to attempt to infect others therewith ? We are a nation of slaves, and we have proved ourselves to be a nation of cowards also. This only is required to prove

us to be a nation of humbugs as well ! This is the implication of the Mahatma's presidential address, which we have characterised as a challenge to our patriotism and to our love of freedom.

Hindu-Muslim Unity

The only item of the original programme of Non-Co-operation that Mahatma Gandhi proposes to retain is, as we have seen, the boycott of foreign cloth ; for which the universalisation of the Charkha is the only means. But he cannot give battle to the enemy even in his own peaceful fashion if the national army is not itself united. What general would lead an army the soldiers of which were making targets of each other ? Mahatma Gandhi is perfectly right when he says that some Hindus and some Muslims prefer the present condition of dependence on Great Britain if they cannot have either wholly Hindu or wholly Muslim India. We claim to know enough of Islam to be able to say that it does not require a Muslim to impose the rule of a Muslim sovereign upon non-Muslim subjects, and it does not require him to subvert the rule of a non-Muslim sovereign over Muslim subjects so long as he is free to follow the commandments of his God. Islam is a theocracy, and in the language of the Quran "there is no government but God's," and "Him alone are we commanded to serve." As in every religion so also in Islam there are certain things which every Muslim is required to do, and certain things which he is required not to do. Between these duties and prohibitions lies a vast stretch of ground in which he is free to roam about, except for certain things which are in the nature of preferences. Now a Muslim can obey no creature of God who commands him to neglect these duties or to disregard these prohibitions, and it makes no difference whether that person is one of his own parents of his master or ruler, whether he is an enemy or a friend, or whether he is a Muslim or a non-Muslim. So long as the temporal power of Islam is adequate for the defence of a Muslim's religious liberty, and is always at the disposal of the Khalifa, it matters

little whether a Muslim is a subject of a Muslim or of a non-Muslim. All he needs is the fullest freedom to obey none but God in the matter of his religious duties and prohibitions. Even if a Muslim sovereign—nay, even if the Khalifa himself commanded him to disobey God, he must refuse; and it is obvious that he could not render unto a non-Muslim Caesar what he could not render unto a Muslim Caesar, because it was due only to God. This being so, we cannot understand where there need be any question of a Muslim's unflinching loyalty to a Swaraj Government that guaranteed *swadharma*. It is only when in the name of Swaraj any obligations are sought to be imposed upon a Muslim which he cannot fulfil without disregarding the obligations imposed upon him by God's government, that he must refuse and rebel. But the same refusal and rebellion would become a religious obligation if it was not a Swaraj Government in India, but the Government of the Great Mughal re-established in Delhi, or that of the Khalifa himself as it used to be in Turkey befo re the deposition of Mohammed Waheeduddin, that sought to impose upon him such obligations. God's government is not necessarily incompatible with Hindu or Christian sovereignly; and yet it may be incompatible with the rule of a Muslim who demands obedience to the commands of a creature of God in preference to the commandments of the Creator Himself. With this important reservàtion, a Muslim can be loyal to any Government, be the ruler Muslim or non-Muslim. But if there is any meaning in religion, this reservation is common to all religions. It makes all the difference in the world which you place first, God or man. Those who call upon Muslims to relegate God to a secondary position ask him to surrender his faith, and to this no Muslim can consent. But to such a surrender no Hindu or Sikh or Parsi or Christian or Jew should consent either; and since we are prepared to guarantee *swadharma* to them all, what wonder is there at all if we desire a similar guarantee of *swadharma* for a Muslim? And yet curiously enough it is just those who would restrict the rights of a Muslim citizen out of deference to non-Muslim sentiments, however out of the common, that demand from him a loyalty

to the Government they would establish in disregard of the prior loyalty that he owes to his Maker. It is because Mahatma Gandhi makes no such demands from Muslim or Hindu, fanatic or atheist, but desires all to regard their conscience as their king, that Muslims accept, and can accept his lead in preference to that of the so-called free thinkers as well as that of the orthodox of other faiths. The place of a Muslim who wants an India subject wholly to the rule of Muslims is not India. But India is not any more the place of a Hindu who wants an India subject wholly to the rule of Hindus. We wish we could believe with Mahatma Gandhi that happily the number of such as want this is few. But few or many, we must all combine to defeat their fanaticism, and to make India safe for *swadharma* and Swaraj.

Having made the requisite reservation in favour of religion, we can now with an easy conscience condemn those who take the name of religion in vain, and who are actuated by material motives which have nothing to do with religion. We are glad to find Mahatma Gandhi agreeing with us in stating that it is interested persons who were disappointed during the palmy days of Non-Co-operation that have found their opportunity now and are trading upon the religious bigotry or the selfishness of both the communities. He agrees with our own etiology of the disease of disunion and of the dissensions in which that disunion has resulted, and clearly states that the result of the activities of such interested persons is written in the history of the feuds of the past two years. The greatest sufferer from all this is, however, religion itself. As Mahatma Gandhi says, "Religion has been travested. Trifles have been dignified by the name of religious tenets which the fanatics claim must be observed at any cost." But we think it is only a slip of the pen when Mahatmaji writes that economic and political causes have been brought into play for the sake of fomenting trouble. In all probability the Mahatma also thinks, as we do, that genuine economic and political grievances existed, and that those who complained on these grounds, or those against whom complaints were made, alike fomented

trouble in the name of religion, or at least became ardent champions of hostile communal groups. They did nothing to check and control the religious passions and prejudices of those quarrelling groups, even if they did not originally rouse them, but, on the contrary, they did much to increase them and to aggravate the situation. The Unity Conference at Delhi has, as Mahatma Gandhi says, paved the way for a settlement of religious differences, and let us hope with him that the Committee of the All-Parties' Conference will find a workable and a just solution of the existing political differences as well. We also echo the words of the Mahatma that "our goal must be removal, at the earliest possible moment, of communal or sectional representation. A common electorate must impartially elect its representatives on the sole ground of merit. Our services must be likewise manned by the most qualified men and women." But, while Mahatma Gandhi is not indifferent to the prospects of the future, practical man that he is, he does not neglect the needs of the present either. He rightly concludes this section of his address by saying that "till that time comes and communal jealousies or preferences become a thing of the past, minorities who suspect the motives of majorities must be allowed their way." He calls upon majorities to set the example of self-sacrifice. For our part we shall be content if they only set the example of bare justice. Let no one, however, think that we despair of this, or even that we regard the prospect as distant. The petty-mindedness of majorities and minorities alike is the result of the scarcity that is universal to-day when only crumbs fall to our lot. We quarrel in our hunger over their distribution ; but when from being beggars outside the palace gates, we become honoured partakers of the good things served on the festive board within, there will, we feel sure, be an end of this undignified scramble. Let neither Hindu nor Muslim judge the Swaraj that is to come by these present indications, which are the fruits not of Swaraj, but of slavery. The difficulty, however, is that Swaraj cannot come unless these indications disappear.

Untouchability

The confidence that all other communities feel in Mahatma Gandhi is amply confirmed by his disinterested championship of the despised and the down-trodden in his own. When others who would not themselves touch them tell the Christians and Muslims, "Hands off the Untouchables," who can wonder that their fellow-feeling is suspect ? But Mahatma Gandhi's admission of his own responsibility for all the faults and failings or his people is, if we may say so, notorious ; and that being so, he is the last person to shirk the high-caste Hindus' duty in the matter of the Untouchables. Not a word that he says against those who keep us enslaved would he scored out when describing the condition of India's suppressed classes and the responsibility of high-caste Hindus. There is nothing halting of indefinite about his views on the subject. He lets the whole world know that "Hindus cannot claim or take Swaraj till they have restored the liberty of the suppressed classes. They have sunk with the latter's suppression." If the historians have correctly chronicled the doings of the Aryan invaders of India, then he says he has no hesitation in declaring that "our helotry is a just retribution for our having created an untouchable cl ss." The priests may prate, but he has no doubt about it that "it is a blasphemy to say that God set apart any portion of humanity as untouchable." He is no less clear when he "would warn the Hindu brethren against the tendency which one sees nowadays of exploiting the suppressed classes for a political end " He goes further and plainly tells the Pharisees among the twice-born that "to remove untouchables, but of the so-called superior castes." And who could be more catholic in his views on religion and caste than the *chust* Sanatan-Dharmi —as the Mahatma always claims to be—who says : "God's grace and revelation are the monopoly of no race or nation. They descend equally upon all who wait upon God. That religion and that nation will be blotted out of the face of the earth which pins its faith to injustice, untruth or violence. God is light, not darkness. God is love, not hate. God is truth, not untruth. God is alone is great. We, His creatures, are but dust."

Need we emphasise once more after this that when Mahatma Gandhi calls upon majorities and minorities, and Hindus and Muslims to unite, and requires the so-called high-born and the so-called low-born to form one fraternity and become one brotherhood, he only throws down a challenge to our much-vaunted patriotism and our love of liberty, equality and fraternity ? May the Almighty give us all the strength to take up that challenge and prove that we deserve the freedom we seek.

Swaraj Scheme

The Mahatma has all along concentrated his attention on the means wherewith he would win Swaraj. But there were others, and in particular that embodiment of sweetness and light, Pandit Bhagwandas of Benares, who would not be happy till they got the Mahatma and the Congress to define the Swaraj they were after. Now, Swaraj could only be one thing, and that is Self-Determination. For our part, *we were content to win Swaraj and leave the entire nation after the victory to determine what all wanted. But others were anxious to determine to-day what they would have the power to establish only after victory had been won to-morrow. Knowing what our people were like, we were opposed to the course they suggested Indians have been brought up so long on unrealities that they have an itch for Constitution-making, imagining that Constitutions can be made by debating societies, and all that is needed to make them is a majority of votes. They have long ceased to make history and to think in terms of history. They do not realise how other nations have sacrificed hundreds and thousands of valuable lives in winning the right to make or repeal a single clause of their Constitution They forget what enemy they have to fight and wrangle with friends so long and with such pugnacity and persistence—nay with so much rancour and ill-will, that they aften turn friends into enemies. So well did the makers of the nation's proverbs know the nation's proclivities that they summed up this particular failing in the saying :*

(Neither cotton nor yarn, but blows must
be exchanged in haggling with the weaver).

But, alas ! the wit of one has not yet become the wisdom of the many. Mahatma Gandhi does not dwell long on the "highly attractive, because speculative, theme" of the future Constitution of India, for, visionary though he be, he is too practical to imitate that too common type among our countrymen. *Shaikh Chillee*, whose ill-fated speculations have supplied our nurseries with one of their most laughter-provoking stories. He may, in the intensity of his devotion to it, and in the strength of his belief in its possibilities, be described by some as the *Shaikh Chillee* of the Charkha. But he tells us that "the end we do not know. For me it is enough to know the means." In other words, he will have no *lattham latha* with the weaver until his Khadi Board has accumulated a sufficient quantity of cotton and of yarn. But since so many of us want a scheme of Swaraj, and the All-Parties' Conference has appointed a Committee to frame such a scheme, the Mahatma has placed before the nation his Twelve Points for the consideration of the Constitution-makers.

We are glad that he disapproved of a Property Franchise so foreign to the genius of the nation ; but we are no less glad that he does not like to set up in its place a literary test either. "The benefit of the clergy" would be a tyranny if the clergy does not want the laity to share its learning. The monks in Europe did not marry, and they tried to swell their ranks by initiating the poor. But where the clergy marries, and is yet an exclusive caste, as among the Hindus, it is apt to perpetuate its line, and to make learning and the power it brings with it the monopoly of a caste. Let us universalise learning. But unless it becomes the common heritage of all, it is dangerous to create a Literary Franchise. "No work, no vote," should be our slogan to-day, and some test of national service should be devised. To-day it may be hand-spinning ; but we are glad that the Mahatma would not confine manual labour for all time to hand-spinning, but would leave it to the action of economic laws once the Charkha is enabled, by the stimulus we now give to hand-spinning, to find its own economic level.

Two of the Mahatma's Twelve Points should clear away much misunderstanding. He would have all monopolies given to foreigners examined by a Commission ; but when that is done, he would give "full guarantees for all vested interests justly acquired." Similarly, he would give "full guarantees of their status to the Indian Chiefs without any hindrance from the Central Government," subject, however, to the right of asylum in self-governing India of their subjects who are not accused of offences "against the Penal Code." This, we hope, we interpret correctly as exclusively offences involving moral turpitude. No foreigner whose vested interest has been justly acquired and no Indian Chief need fear that injustice will be done to him by self-governing India. Indeed, we trust that every territory of which an Indian Chief has been unjustly deprived by the present foreign Central Government will be ceded back to him. Knowing Indian States as we do, we feel certain that self-governing India will have no difficulty in dealing with Indian Chiefs, and that Indian States will before long become as self-governing in the truest sense of the term as the rest of India, so that none of the citizens of such States will need to seek asylum outside.

Not the least important point presented for our consideration by Mahatma Gandhi is that which makes Swaraj synonymous with *Swadharma*. The so-called freethinkers are in practice far more intolerant than this "religion-ridden" Hindu and Sanatani who would have self-governing India recognise the "complete religious freedom of various denominations," subject only to mutual forbearance. Where such forbearance is not practised the world becomes a hell. True religion is that which does not permit persecution and compulsion to enter its diocese and the first article of the creed of which is tolerance and forbearance. Hali wrote of those who neither fought the Hindu nor bore ill-will towards the *Gueber*, who eschewed evil and rewarded evil with good, and he asked those who thought this world to be a Hell to come and see the beauties of this Heaven. In a sense different from that of Satan in Milton's *Paradise Lost* :

The mind is its own place, and in itself
Can make a heaven of hell, a hell of heaven.

All that we need is to produce the proper religious mentality, and not to make people irreligious.

Independence

Since we could not have hoped to be rid just yet of that hardy annual, the proposal to amend the creed of the Congress and define the Swaraj we seek as Swaraj outside the British Empire or Commonwealth, Mahatma Gandhi did will to devote a section of his address to the subject of independence. We agree with him that the British recognition of Indians' complete equality "would be a greater triumph than a complete severance of the British connection." The conversion of the infidel is certainly a greater triumph for the evangelist and the apostle than the elimination of infidelily through the wasteful process of killing the infidels. Was not the triumph of the Last of the Messengers of Allah, who was able to convert his people in his life-time, and who has been acknowledged even by his critics to have been "the most successful" among the prophets, greater than that of Noah, whose prayer was answered when the flood deluged and destroyed his people few of whom had he been able to convert ? The Mahatma sees the future with a clear gaze when he tells us that "the better mind of the world desires to-day not absolutely independent States warring one against another, but a federation of friendly inter-dependent States." He desires the ability to be totally independent without asserting the independence. *But, alas ! only too many of the champions of complete independence are anxious to assert their independence without doing much to develop the ability to be independent.* It is, we think, manifest enough that "Britain really means subjection in spite of her declarations to the contrary," and it is not because we are in any doubt about this that we would wait and see. We wait because many of us do not yet hate our slavery sufficiently, and our task should rather be to make them realise that they are slaves, and to make them sick of their slavery, than to tell Britain what we think of her declarations.

franchise and was suspending other items of Non-Co-operation as a national programme only with a view to open the doors of the Congress wide enough for Co-operators like her and the Liberals to enter, is now anxious to found an Indian National *political* Congress, apparently because after the suspension of Non-Co-operation, the Congress has ceased to be a political organisation. It is on such occasions that one recalls the poet's lament :

Main hua kafir, to woh kafir Musalman ho gaya

(When I turned Infidel, that Infidel became one of the Faithful).

So far as Mahatma Gandhi is concerned, every item of the Non-Co-operation programme stands where it did before. We are glad he has emphasised the need for the maintenance of national schools and colleges. We wish Non-Co-operators will take to heart what he says about them. "They cannot be given up so long as even a few pupils are left. It must be a point of honour with the respective provinces to keep up their colleges and schools. Suspension of Non-Co-operation should not have any injurious effect on these institutions. On the contrary, greater effort than ever before should be made to maintain and strengthen them." But we would like to encourage the students also in the existing national institutions of India, and what should encourage them more than the words of the Mahatma who has been quietly watching them. "Throughout the country," says he, "finest and silent work has been done by the non-co-operating students. Theirs is a great and noble sacrifice. From a worldly stand-point they have perhaps lost the prospect of brilliant careers. I suggest to them, however, that from the national stand-point they have gained more than they have lost. They left their schools or colleges because it was through them that the youth of the nation were insulted and humiliated in the Punjab. *The first link in the chain of our bondage is forged in these institutions. The corresponding national institutions, however insufficiently managed they may be, are the factories where the first instruments*

of our freedom are forged. After all, the hope of the future centres round the boys and girls studying in these national institutions. I, therefore, regard the upkeep of these institutions as the first on provincial funds." We feel it necessary to repeat at once his warning that "the time is past when we can be satisfied with the word 'National' on the signboard of the school and the knowledge that it is not affiliated to any Government University or is not otherwise controlled by the Government." In other words, that school or college or University is not necessarily national which is badly housed and ill-equipped. "Love in a cottage" is better than a palace where love dwelleth not. But a cottage without love is certainly no better, if not worse, than a palace without it.

Repression and the Remedy

It is a sad reflection on our Non-Co-operation and our love of reform that we cannot persist in Non-Co-operation and the work of reform without the use of a stimulant such as an active struggle with Government provides. To cite only one instance, why could not the nation continue to fight against drink, drugs and dopes without the use of such an intoxicant as pugnacious picketing ? Some temperance work still goes on, but such silent service has no other chronicler except the Mahatma himself and a few others. Council-work still attracts some of the most energetic among us because of the heady wine of recurring debates.

In the meantime repression goes on in spite of the Council wrangling. Bengal has so far vindicated its manhood by rejecting slavery in the shape of the Bill which sought to make the Ordinance permanent. But this must now be followed up by more solid work on the Charkha, which alone will develop the nation's strength from within. The Mahatma says truly enough that "repression does for a true man or a nation what fire does for gold."

Nakamiyon se kam Mohabbat ka ban gaya,
Ek dhat thi ki aag mein padkar nikhar gai.

(Repeated failure accomplished the work of Love. It was a metal that got chastened by the fire through which it passed.)

How truly does the Mahatma says : "In 1921 we answered repression with Civil Disobedience and invited the Government to do its worst. But to-day we are obliged to eat the humble pie. We are not ready for Civil Disobedience. We can but prepare for it. Preparation for Civil Disobedience means discipline, self-restraint, a non-violent but resisting spirit, cohesion, and, above all, scrupulous and willing obedience to the known laws of God and such laws of man as are in furtherance of God's laws. *But unfortunately we have neither discipline nor self-restraint enough for our purpose ; we are either violent, or our non-violence is unresisting ; we have not enough cohesion, and the laws that we obey, whether of God or man, we obey compulsorily.*"

The daily defiant breach of laws both of God and man which we have been witnessing as between Hindus and Muslims makes the Mahatma inexpressibly sad, and he says that "those who believe that India's deliverance lies through violence are entitled to glot over the free fights that take place between us." But we doubt if such free fights prepare us even for violence, let alone for Civil Disobedience "the one matchless and invincible weapon at the disposal of the oppressed." It seems to us that little courage is required for this kind of fighting. How will these rowdies face the British army when they cannot even face the Indian Police ? These are only mock fights of the cowards in the two communities, and when we see neither the Hindus nor the Muslims behaving against each other as the Sikhs behaved against the Government at Guru-ka-Bagh and against the Mahant's men at Nankana, we are inclined to doubt the Mahatma's statement that "India is admittedly the best repository and exponent of non-violence." What we want are a few deaths of the non-violent who would face a maddened crowd in defence of the sanctity of their places of worship and die without striking a blow themselves. Better still we want the death of a few Muslims and a few

Hindus at the hands of maddened crowds of their *own* communities while defending the honour and the sacred places of the *other* community !

What Mahatma Gandi wants India to discover is a force more potent and more effective than the violence of a violent Government and of violent revolutionaries. He regards repression as a chronic symptom of a chronic disease. That disease in European dominance and Asiatic and African subjection, and he finely tells us that Kipling "miscalled the White Man's Yoke as the White Man's Burden." In Mauritius, in Kenya, in South Africa and in Fiji, just as in Egypt and the Sudan, and nearer home at Guru-ka-Bagh and Jaito and in Bengal, it is the same disease, and repression is its surest symptom. Repression, the Mahatma tells us, is not an extraordinary thing whether in Egypt or in the Punjab or in Bengal "*We must treat its periodic eruption* in some shape or other, in some province or other, *as our normal condition till we come to our own.*" The remedy lies in devising a sanction to back the demands of the people. There is no rhetoric here but pure and undefiled truth when the Mahatma says : "If we can but speak with a united voice and know our own mind, it would be well. If we can develop the power to keep foreign cloth from our land, it would be better. We are ready *then* for the sanction."

The Mahatma's Faith and our Own

There are shrinking souls that always doubt and hesitate, and it was as a tribute that littleness pays to greatness, if not as a tribute that vice pays to virtue, that they joined the ranks of Non-Co-operators after having opposed it as long as they safely could. It is they who are telling us that Non-Co-operation is *abandoned* because Mahatma Gandhi advises its *suspension* when they and their likes are not ready for it. But speaking for himself he tells us that "as an individual I cannot—will not—do so, as long as the Government remains what it is. It is not merely a policy with me : it is an article of faith." That faith is ours as well, and of every Muslim's who seeks guidance

in the Holy Quran. Mahatma Gandhi tells us that he cannot and will not hate Englishmen ; but neither will he bear their yoke. The Prophet was preaching the brotherhood of Islam to his followers, and told them that they should assist their brethren in faith whether they be oppressors or oppressed. Human nature is essentially good, and even the simple dwellers of the desert could not accept unquestioningly the Prophet's dictum that an oppressing brother should be assisted as well as the oppressed brother. So one of them expressed his doubt and wanted the Prophet to resolve it. The Prophet repeated the dictum, but explained that the best way of assisting the oppres-ing brother was to *prevent* his oppression. Assistance and resistance are in this sense but relative terms, and so are Co-operation and Non-Co-operation. Islam when it taught us to non-co-operate thirteen long centuries before Mahatma Gandhi and his Congress, so that no Muslim can suspend, much less abandon, Non-Co-operation when the Congress or even Mahatma Gandhi may do so, laid down in the Quran the limits of co-operation and non-co-operation for all time. The dictum of the Quran will stand even when not a vestige of the Congress creed or its resolutions remains, and it is this :

> (Co-operate in righteousness and piety, and do not co-operate in sinfulness and transgression.)

Those who were most zealous in the cause of Non-Co-operation five years ago and cited the Quran at every turn cannot now be permitted to take a graceful curve and co-operate. They were the most unforgiving and the least charitable of the critics of such Ulama as sought a *heela-i-shara'i* (legal loop-hole) whenever they desired to transgress an inconvenient law of the Shari'at. Such Ulama have much to answer for ; but that cannot absolve their critics who seek just as surely a *heela-i-shara'i* for escaping from the many discomforts of Non-Co-operation. He who acknowledges the law and does not follow it is a criminal ; but he is not guilty of high treason and is not a rebel and an outlaw. He who acknowledges the Shari'at and yet departs in his conduct from it is a sinner, but he cannot—must not—despair of God's

IV

COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION

When the Unity Conference was held at Delhi, last September, Mahatma Gandhi, reading the root cause of Hindu-Muslim discussions, had, among other things, suggested that a Committee should be appointed to invite representative opinion and investigate the whole question of the share of various communities in representation and in the public services and report its findings by a certain date. A large section of the Conference, however, seemed unwilling to take up the question, and the Conference dispersed after adopting certain resolutions based on tolerance and inter-communal accommodation with regard to religious beliefs, observances and propaganda.

When two months later the All Parties' Conference met, the adjustment of communal shares in representation and in public services was one of the subjects it had to deal with. But since the Conference had also to frame a scheme of Swaraj and devise means whereby all parties could unite with each other and work on the common platform of the Indian National Congress. it was soon felt that the only way to do any real business was to entrust the work to a representative committee. Mahatma Gandhi had, in consultation with others, proposed a score of names for the membership of such a committee, but a scramble took place for inclusion in the committee, and to the Mahatma the only safe course seemed to accept all nominations and to remove the inequalities resulting from such a haphazard "selection" by authorising the committee to co-opt other members from parties or communities inadequately represented.

The Committee was large enough already and the addition of co-opted members made it, when it met at Delhi two months later, quite as large as the original Conference. This led to the selection of another committee, still very unwieldy, for the purpose of adjusting communal shares, and of yet another and

smaller committee to consider and report on the scheme of Swaraj prepared by Mrs. Besant and some others working with her in her Convention. Little progress was made in the course of the discussions carried on by this latter committee appointed to adjust them led, as if inevitably, to a series of private and informal conversations, and ultimately to the adjournment of further discussion to the end of February.

The Tread-Mill Tribe

From this bare chronicle of a barren series of meetings of large committees and small committees, of formal debates and informal conversations, each individual will draw conclusions according to his own individual temperament. The pessimists are no doubt in a majority, and they will naturally tell us that much valuable time has been wasted ; and in all probability the Hindu pessimists will accuse the Muslims of being the obstacle in the way of settlement, and the Muslim pessimists will similarly accuse the Hindus. We are not pessimists ourselves but to us, too, one thing seems plain enough, and it is this. Whatever Mahatma Gandhi and a dozen others of his way of thinking may think, the bulk of the Hindus and Muslims that assembled at Delhi a fortnight ago do not yet appear to us to feel that utter detestation of India's present-day slavery which alone can compel them to adjust their communal differences without delay and to make a united demand for Swaraj To us every day that passes without the attainment of Swaraj is a course of additional torture, and we confess we find it hard to be patient with those whose interminable arguments on the one side or on the other lead us nowhere They only serve to remind us of the Tread-mill. They are not indolent, nor are they quiet. On the contrary, they are always busy and often loud. But they only go round and round, and make no progress.

Impatience will not, however, serve any purpose, nor is it possible to obtain Swaraj merely by a few people's utterly detesting the present-day slavery of India. It is true that if an

appeal is made by such people to the country at large, and the masses are told without any reservation or reticence what such people feel at heart about this Tread-mill Tribe of politicians, and how Swaraj is being delayed by their dilatory debates, the masses would lose much of the confidence that at present they mistakenly repose in such procrastinating politicians. But it will mean an open breach with them, and probably a fairly long fight which would be enough to absorb the energies and attention of the small group that is yearning for Swaraj. There are worse things than war, and we may yet have to wage one against these wranglers. But war is certainly a greal evil, and although we have been credited with a great deal of militancy, we would like to avoid it as long as we possibly can, and in the meantime to explore every avenue that may be hoped to lead to a reconciliation between the Hindus and the Muslim irreconcilables of to-day.

Trust Swaraj and not Communal Representation

Our own view is that nothing could be worse than the existing servitude of the nation, and that no second stage of India can be worse than the first. Convinced as we are of this we have no hesitation in telling the Muslims that they will not be the losers if they make no stipulations whatever with the Hindus as regards the future, and make no provisions in the scheme of Swaraj for safeguarding their interests by means of communal representation. We do not say this because we trust every Hindu who talks of communalism as being incompatible with nationalism, while he still thinks that his food would be polluted if a Muslim or a Christian or a Parsee touched it. It is cant and hypocricy on the part of a very large section of Hindus to talk of nationalism and to rebuke those who give expression to the apprehensions they feel as regards the rights of minority communities of backward classes and who would devise safeguards for them through communal and class representation. If, therefore, we strongly advise the Muslims to give up all thought of communal representation it is because we feel that the mentality does not change for the better, the

Muslims will still be able to wrest back the rights of their community from the majority if it continued to remain communal and monopolistic while pretending to be national and just to all. When a commodious ship with sufficient room for passengers and crews is sailing in smooth waters, there is little temptation to push and hustle and use one's elbows too vigorously. Then the mail passengers smile and bow to the ladies and make room for them in the politest of manners and the crew is only too conscious of its own place and even subservient to the passengers. The real test of the passengers' chivalry and the crew's discipline comes only with the storm and the shipwreck when the boats are being lowered and launched on a turbulent sea. In such cases it sometimes happens that the captain has to pull out his revolver and, while shouting out the order : "Women and children first," has to stand ready to shoot down the first man who would in his excessive selfishness and terror rush to the boats before his turn and create confusion. To-day we are experiencing a storm and in the scramble for a seat in the boats we have proved ourselves in only too many cases to be both undisciplined and unchivalrous. When Swaraj is established, we feel that this scramble would cease, and politeness and good manners and a proper appreciation of our duties as well as of our rights and of other people's rights and duties would return. With only crumbs from the tables of our rulers falling to the 320 millions of India's famishing population there is no wonder if we lack table-manners. But with the board groaning under the weight of good things to eat we can be trusted to acquire table-manners, and to cease to scramble. Such is human nature, and it is this human nature that we must all trust even if to-day we do not trust Hindu nature or Muslim nature.

If, however, we ultimately find that we had been too trustful, and that the majority disregards the rights of the minorities, there is no constitution on earth made by lawyer or layman that can prevent our demanding justice and getting it. If justice cannot be obtained by counting heads, it may become necessary to obtain it by cutting them, or by adopting the more human

but not less courageous methods of Non-Violent, Non-cooperation and Civil Disobedience. The Muslims are suspected in some Hindu quarters of desiring to invite their co-religionists abroad to subvert the Swaraj Government and re-establish Muslim rule. Everything that is humanly possible has been done to remove this suspicion, and we trust it will not be revived again. But if the Hindu majority itself convert Swaraj into Hindu *raj* pure and simple, Mahatma Gandhi himself would readily admit that Muslims who do not share his religion of non-violence would be justified in seeking the aid of their brothers outside India to put an end to their slavery.

We have every hope that Swaraj will itself prove the sovereign remedy for all our national ills, but if these hopes are belied, there is nothing that can prevent the Muslims from seeking and securing justice through Civil War or through Civil Disobedience. If, therefore, they are unwilling to trust the future, which only means to trust human nature and to trust themselves, that argues woeful political debility among the Muslims.

The Hindu Attitude

Being Muslims ourselves, we have not hesitated to advise them to make no stipulations to-day about communal representation. But if we had been Hindus we would have even more unhesitatingly asked the Hindus to agree to all that Muslims demanded. For after all the Muslims do not demand that the Hindu majority should, in a single case, be converted into a minority, and so long as majority rule is accepted, the Hindu position in all constituencies is safe enough. But if the Muslims have given proof of political debility, the Hindus have shown no greater political virility. We entirely agree with those who do not like the idea of communal representation disfiguring the Swaraj constitution of India. But a communal monopoly is worse than communal representation, and when majority rule is accepted by the minority, it is only right that the minority should be credited with some abhorrence of communal representation. It does not increase a minority's

faith in the majority's sincerity if a community enjoying the comfortable position of security that its majority gives it behaves as if it enjoyed a monopoly of the abhorrence of the communal representation. With all the abhorrence that we feel with regard to communal representation, we cannot pretend to think that if it is allowed to continue for a short period after Swaraj is established, we shall never be rid of it. That would depend upon the treatment that the majority metes out to the minorities and we cannot help thinking that morbid mistrust of communal representation argues on the part of the majority some mistrust of itself. It is not only the Muslims that had given expression to apprehension with regard to the rule of the Hindu majority. Non-Brahmans in Southern and Western India have shown perhaps as great mistrust of the Brahmans, and Ramaswami Mudliars are as much the *karma* of Satyamurtis as Fazl-i-Hussains are the *karma* of Lajpatrais. Communities can evade their *karma* in this world far less than individuals, and it seems to us that there is no help for it but for each generation to pay the penalty for the misdeeds of the previous generation, and to act in such a manner as not to penalise the next generation.

The Lucknow Pact

It has been said on behalf of the Hindu community, that if communal representation must remain, then the Lucknow Pact is the utmost limit which in such representation can be conceded. The *Comrade* had ceased to be published full two years before the Lucknow Pact had been concluded in 1916, and we were in no way responsible for that Pact. Nevertheless we would have favoured its continuance even now that we were framing a Swaraj scheme, were it not for the fact that in the Pact Bengal Muslims had been for the time being deprived of their majority and reduced to 90 per cent representation in spite of a Muslim population as high as 54 per cent. That sort of arrangement may be fair for a time, but it cannot be maintained in a permanent Swaraj constitution. Apart from that, the reluctance of the Hindus to allow the Muslims

to be in majority even in two provinces out of so many is to our mind extremely unsporting. The Hindu Mahasabha Committee was anxious that even if the All-Parties Committee arrived at a conclusion which gave Bengal and the Punjab Muslims majorities to which their proportion of population entitled them, that conclusion should only be regarded as tentative, and that no conclusion of this sort should be final until it was assured that the Central Government, in which the Hindus were, of course, in a majority, would retain control over these Provincial Governments. If the strong and even *dominant* Hindu minorities in the Punjab and Bengal can be so nervous with regard to Muslim minorities there, then what wonder is it if Muslim minorities seek to afeguard themselves by means of communal representation ?

Separate or Mixed Electorates

The question that has been debated at the greatest length, however, is whether communal representation, even if tolerated, should be secured through separate communal electorates or through territorial electorates. Where the minority is too substantial to be swamped by the majority, we certainly think that it should be bold enough to agree to joint territorial electorates, and safeguards such as proportional representation with a single transferable vote or a system of cumulative voting may be utilized. Unfortunately, these safeguards are generally very insufficiently understood, and those who recommend them should explain them to the minorities whose adequate representation they seek to insure. But we know of no method that can ensure a small minority from being swamped by an overwhelming majority, unless it has a number of seats reserved for it, and voting takes place in separate electorates of its own. It is true that in times of communal tension, such as that we have been going through ever since the reaction in far off Punjab of the troubles in Malabar, candidates most hostile to the majority will be returned by the minority voting in separate electorates of its own. But that is the inevitable *karma* of a majority's swamping the minority in a joint terri-

torial electorate, and returning, even when a certain number of seats are reserved for minority, some men of straw belonging to the latter but not in the least representing its views and wishes.

The return of the most bigoted and the most narrow-minded members by an infuriated minority in times of communal tension will at least provide a safety valve for the feelings of the minority. But will the situation be improved if the majority community keep sitting down on this safety valve and fill the seats reserved for the minority community with men *belonging* to it but in no way *representing* it? Such nominees of the majority, pretending to speak for the minority and going into the lobby at the heels of the majority will still further provoke and exasperate the minority, and inter-communal relations, far from being harmonised, will be still further exacerbated. It must be remembered that a minority is after all a minority and no matter what you do for it, "suffering is the badge of the tribe." To deprive it even of minority representation by swamping it is to play the bully and the tyrant, and that is far less compatible with nationalism than communal representation of minorities secured to them through separate communal electorates.

Much of the Swarajist case that council entry is necessary rests on the bitter experience of the first "Reform" Councils when, through the self-denying ordinance passed by the non-co-operators, the Moderates had the entire field of representation left to themselves. Returned to the councils, generally speaking, by the few votes whom they could persuade to come to polling booths, and opposed by Non-co-operating candidates, they spoke in those councils as if they had a mandate from the entire nation and were entitled to speak in its name. There was no end to their assurance and self-complaisance, and this more than anything else infuriated the impatient among the Non-co-operators and let to the Swarajist revolt. At the last election they swept the board in several provinces, and if the Non-changers had not kept aloof, as they did, there

would have been fewer Independents and still fewer Liberals than we still find in the Councils. This was because the Non-Co-operators had not been in majority in the country and only constituted a small majority, co-operators would have swamped them and Non-Co-operators would have been left totally unrepresented. In such cases the only thing that Non-Co-operators could have done would have been to go to the country and convert it to their own views. The question is, do we want minority communities to remain unpresented unless they can swell their ranks by religious conversion ? Generally speaking, political convictions, and quite a large number of votes sit on the fence and tumble down almost at the last moments on one side or the other according to the comparative force and effectiveness of the propaganda on the two sides. Religious propaganda is happily not of this find, and we have already had sufficiently bitter experience recently of propaganda of this character carried on in the religious field among the Malkanas and elsewhere. If we do not want a repetition of such rivalry in the religious field, then to refuse to small minority communities separate electorates of their own, in which they can be secure from being swamped by overwhelming majorities is in practice even worse than disfranchising them. For if they are disfranchised, nobody could at least pretend to speak in their name and commit them to course of which they do not approve. Let us only and their, like communal representation itself, separate electorates are needed only so long as the temptation on the part of majorities to misrepresent minorities or the mistrust of majorities on the part of minorities persist. When this temptation and this mistrust disappear, neither separate electorates nor communal representation itself are needed.

Unfettered Choice of Representation

Where communities differ from each other very widely and apprehend that their interests will not be properly looked after by other communities, to give them separate electorates of their own is nothing more than to allow the two parties in

a law-suit each to choose its own advocates for both, even if the choice in the case of the advocate of the other party is limited and its advocate is to be chosen from among members of its own community. After all it is the party's *Interests* that are to be represented and advocated, and not its *Creed.* But in law-suit where each party is given the natural right to choose its own advocate, its choice is not fettered, and it is the *best* advocate of its interests from any community. Muslims choose Hindu advocates and attorneys and *vice versa,* and nobody regards this as unnatural. It is all a matter of confidence. We strongly urge that so long as Hindus and Muslims genuinely feel that they are like parties in a law-suit, and are therefore allowed to choose their representatives themselves without interference from others, they should also be free to choose as their representative the man in whom they have the greatest confidence, irrespective of the creed he holds and the community to which he belongs. It is the freedom of choice that minorities need and it is illogical to give it to them by means of separate electorates and restrict it by compelling them to choose their representatives from a single community. Mahatma Gandhi was a better and more trusted representative of the Muslims of India in the matter of the Khilafat than Mian Muhammad Shafi or even Mr. Jinnah. But we could also name a dozen leading Muslims who would more truly represent the untouchables than an equal number of leading Hindus that we could name. A true nationalist could have nothing better than so to win by his national service the confidence of all communities—other communities as well as his own—as to be returned by any communal constituency for which he chose to stand. The majority of the so-called Nationalists of to-day are suspect, so far as minority communities are concerned, because they spend far more time and energy in running down what they choose to call communalism than in proving their own Nationalism by means of their national service. It is certainly better to work for the good than to rail at the evil.

Excess Representation

"Protection of minorities" is a principle that is generally conceded, but it must not be considered to be identical with the representation of minority communities in excess of their proportion in the population in the country. If the 14 or 15 per cent of the Muslim population in United Provinces is allowed to return 30 per cent of the representatives, or the 19 or 20 per cent of the Muslim population of the Bombay Presidency, including Sind, is allowed to return one-third of the representatives, the Muslim minority no doubt receives a measure of protection. One may concede this even in the case of the 10 or 11 per cent. of Bihar and Orissa returning 25 per cent of the representatives. But we fail to see how the 6 or 7 per cent. Muslim population of Madras or the 4 per cent. Muslim population of the Central Provinces and Berar is protected, and that, too, in an "adequate" and "effective" manner, by being allowed to return 15 per cent. of representatives in each case.

No real injury can be apprehended to Hindu interests even if Muslim representation in all the provinces in which the Muslims are in a minority is raised in a Swaraj Government to one-third, as in the Bombay Presidency to-day. We can well understand if to-day, with an alien, bureaucratic Government and existing tension between Hindus and Muslims, quite a number of Muslims representatives in the Bombay Council do not follow the Nationalists into the division lobbies, and the leader of the Nationalists in the Council would consequently think twice before agreeing to give to Muslims one third representation in Bihar and Orissa, Madras and C P. and Berar also even under Swaraj. But a generous gesture such as this would secure the confidence of the Muslims all over India far more effectively than a hundred speeches on the virtues of Nationalism and on the benefit of Joint Electorates. Only the Muslims must remember that generosity cannot be had under compulsion any more than confidence, and if they cannot be compelled to repose confidence in the Hindu

majority the Hindu majority, too, cannot be compelled to be generous to them.

The Via Media

In the present state of inter-communal feelings, the best thing to do, and the only one consonant with Muslim dignity is :

(*a*) to ask for clear-cut share of representation in exact proportion to population ;

(*b*) to leave it to the minority in every constituency to say whether it would have its representation secured to it through separate electorates or would trust to the justice of joint territorial electorates ; and

(*c*) to protect the minorities by means of fundamental laws which no majorities could alter and by means of a provision on the lines of the proviso in the Lucknow Pact, that no bill, nor any clause thereof, nor a resolution affecting any community—which question is to be determined by the members of that community in the elected body concerned—shall be proceeded with if three-fourth of the members of the community in that body oppose the bill or any clause thereof or the resolution.

Fundamental Laws

The Unity Conference has already passed a number of resolutions which declare the rights of various communities and also the manner in which those rights can be exercised without infringing the rights of other communities and with due consideration for their feelings and sentiments. It should not be difficult to frame certain Fundamental Laws incorporating the decisions of the Unity Conference. The late L. Lajpat Rai has spent a great deal of energy in trying to prove that there is no such thing as an absolute right Either this is a platitude the discussion of which would only serve to make the obvious obscure, or Lalaji has used his talents to make the

worse appear the better reason, and to deprive some people in India of rights which in other countries do not need even to be declared. Such abstract reasoning can be productive of no practical good, and if any community in India cherishes any rights which it cannot leave at the mercy of possibly hostile majorities, the proper course for it is to convince the representatives of various communities that they are its undebted rights, and that they can be exercised without any infringement of the rights of others, and after that to have them embodied into Fundamental Laws.

The Proviso

It is not possible to foresee everything to-day, nor is it proper to multiply Fundamental Laws which cannot be altered except by the unanimous vote of the representatives of the entire nation, Therefore a provision on the lines of the proviso of the Lucknow Pact which we have suggested should be included among the Fundamental Laws of constitution. We are told that although such a proviso existed in the Lucknow Pact, the Government entirely ignored it when framing the Government of India Act and the regulations made thereunder, while adopting the proportion of representation laid down in that Pact. From this we are asked to conclude that the Government will again ignore this proviso. With regard to this we may say that the Government ignored it in the framing of the scheme of Reforms not because there was any intrinsic difficulty in embodying it in the constitution, nor in the interests of the majority community, but in its own interests, since it wanted to keep its own hands unfettered. In framing a constitution for the Swaraj Government we shall not be studying the convenience of the alien bureaucracy, but of the Indian Nation itself, and, there is many a provision that the bureaucracy would like to ignore but which the Nation must insist upon, and this is one of those provisions. It is also said that each community will object to many a reasonable thing that other communities would like to enact or resolve, and thus the Nation would proceed no further on

account of such communal obstacles. We must say we do not foresee any such difficulty, because we cannot believe that any community would be guilty of such wanton obsruction as is apprehended, but even if any community could be guilty of it, other communities could soon bring it to its senses by convincing it that two can play that game. The measure we have suggested provides its own corrective and legeslative deadlocks would before long compel the obstructing community to make its peace with other communities, and use the proviso only in extraordinary cases, for which alone it is meant.

Local Bodies and Universities

Many of those who are opposed to communal representation urge that even if it is to be tolerated in Legislative Councils, it should not be extended to local bodies. It seems to us that the whole discussion of communal representation is not ony an evil, but a necessary evil, then it must be accepted everywhere that the necessary for it exists. And if the highly educated man that would be returned by the electorates to the Legislative Councils cannot be trusted to represent truly and faithfully the interests of minority communities or special interests, what expectations of such true and faithful representation can we have from the kind of men that are returned as representatives to local bodies ? To our mind this desire to confine communal representation, which is obviously based on mistrusts, to Legislative Councils, is the greatest condemnation possible of the men of light and leading in India. Like the question of separate electorates, we think the decision on the subject of having communal representation in local bodies or not should be left to minority communities in each constituency. Happy are the people who can do without it, but if they cannot do without it, no one else has a right to compel them to trust representatives selected for them by majorities which they regard as hostile. As for the Universities we see no reason to exclude them. It is not as if misrepresentation or mistrust is the monopoly of the ignorant. The corruption of the best is worst, and Indian degradation is

largely due to the defective character of India's leading men. If cowardice, as the Mahatma thinks, is the besetting sin of a large section of the Hindus, and ignorance that of the Muslims, then the greatest national benefactor is that Muslim who can give courage to the Hindus and induce them to shed their fear of the Muslims, and also that Hindu who can arrange to have Muslim children and youths educated in ever-increasing numbers and is thus able to reduce the existing Muslim ignorance. And yet in the Punjab where Hindu-Muslim tension is the greatest, one of the greatest grievances of the Hindus against the Muslims is that the Education Minister, who is a Muslim, has been endeavouring to reduce Muslim ignorance by making it possible for a larger proportion of Muslims to be admitted into the existing educational institutions financed by the State, though still in a smaller proportion than that of their population ! In these circumstances who can say that the majority can be trusted to do justice to the minority in Universities and other educational bodies. If it cannot be trusted in one case, it can be trusted in no case, and if it can be trusted in one case, it can be trusted in all.

Public Services

Last but not least is the question of the adjustment of communal shares in public services. Were it merely a question of the loaves and fishes of the office, even then there is no reason why the division of these loaves and fishes should not be fair to all communities. But since it is the public servants that execute the laws framed by the Legislature, to permit any community to monopolise the executive is just as bad as, if not worse, than permitting it to monopolise the Legislatures. The only question we have to settle is that, whereas selection of the legislators is left to the constituencies, and they are responsible for electing the most efficient persons for the job, what other body must select the executive ? The whole subject to communal representation, mixed and separate electorates, reservation of seats, proportional representation and cumulative voting has been discussed so often and so long

only because it is agreed on all hands that a method should be devised which should as far possible eliminate the chances of partiality in the selection of legislators. How then can the selection of the executive be left to take care of itself, and no effort made to devise some scheme which would similarly eliminate the chances of partiality in this sphere? As a matter of fact, it is against the bureaucraitc executive, which is the citadel of this alien bureaucracy, that the most determined onslaughts have been made by the fighters of the nation, and the bureaucracy too has been far more reluctant to agree to the Indianisation of the executive than the Indianisation of legislatures. The same appears to be true of the Hindu majority, and precisely on the same old ground of greater efficiency. Oh ! Efficiency, what injustices and what jests are perpetrated in thy name ! For the sake of efficiency itself it is necessary to appoint an impartial Public Services Board, on which all communities should be adequately represented and which should see that all communities receive impartial "patronage." As for efficiency the rule should be that for every grade of public service a certain minimum standard of literary qulifications, among others, should be fixed : but so long as the members of a community satisfy that minimum standard of education required for that particular grade of service, they should not be kept out merely because members of another community satisfy just a little higher standard, even though the former community is inadequately represented in the public service, while the latter community is represented in excess of its numerical protection. Efficiency must be safe-guarded in fixing the requisite minimum standard and adhering to it, and not by closing our eyes to the weakness of human nature which is well illustrated by our national proverb :—

(The blind man distributes sweets and time after
time hands them over to his own kith and kin.)

The alien bureaucracy has been doing nothing less than this and we have all condemned it. Can we condemn it any the less because a section of our nation appears to be equally *grasping and acquisitive* ?

One word more and we have done. Lala Lajpat Rai in his questionnaire circulated among Hindu associations and leading men, does not forget to ask whether the redistribution of provinces is advisable. The Congress has already redistributed the provinces on the linguistic basis, and Mahatma Gandhi in his Presidential Address at Belgaum has made such a redistribution one of his Twelve Points But it is from the Punjab that we hear once more about the need of redistribution and that apparently on no basis at all except this that the Hindus consider it insufferable to remain in a minority in the Punjab. They would therefore minimise the apprehended effects of being in a minority for as large a portion of the Hindus of the Punjab as possible by dividing their Province into two, so that the largest possible section of the Hindus of the Punjab may be rid of Muslim "dominance" even if all cannot escape that horrible fate ! Now the Punjab is after all not a very large province as provinces go, and if any province is unwieldy it is the United Provinces. No division on a linguistic basis can, however, be made there, and no Muslim has yet devised a method of ridding the Muslims whose ruling families had their habitation in the United Provinces of Hindu "dominance" in that province. It is very curious that the very people who preach to us oftenest the doctrines of trusting Hindu majorities show the greatest mistrust of the Muslim majority in the Punjab Now by such timidity and not by such tremors will nationalism be advanced and communalism eliminated from the soil of India.

We have exhaustively dealt with all aspects of this question, and in doing so we have used as much candour as is conversant with courtesy. Frankly we are not impressed with the high brow Hindu attitude, nor yet with the Muslim attitude indicative of not a little of mendicancy and of a complete lack of self-confidence. On both sides there has been an exhibition of spirit of driving a bargain. While the two "High Contracting Parties" are still haggling, the Higher Contracting Third Party continues to domineer over both. This thing must end, or we must close all discussion and settle down to enjoy the prospect of perpetual slavery. The Hindus too need Swaraj, but they

must know that it is not easy to win it without their winning the confidence of Muslims. But to our mind the Muslims need it far more than the bulk of Hindus, and they must purchase it at any price. They cannot, of course, purchase it at the cost of their honour or faith, for nothing can be Swaraj for which honour or faith have to be bartered away. Short of that, they can pay everything and still buy it cheap.

Once more we say to the Muslims, trust human nature, trust yourself, and trust God. Do not tolerate for a minute longer the slavery that keeps both body and soul in chains. If you hesitate you are lost. Make no stipulations for the future but ask for Swaraj without any terms without any conditions. Demand it. Struggle for it, suffer for it, and die for it, for when it is won the entire face of the nation will be changed, and you will be safe enough without communal representation, without separate electorates and without a fixed share in the public services. Above all Swaraj must mean *Swadharma*, and if you value religious freedom more than others, as you think, yours must be the larger sacrifice. But while we say this, we know that it is the easiest thing for the Hindus to remove Muslim mistrust of Swaraj by a generosity that will cost them but title.

V

IN DEFENCE OF GANDHIJI'S LEADERSHIP

Nobody can accuse Lala Lajpat Rai of having denied to us his "light and leading" since his return from Europe last September. The Hindu community is not ideally organised today, in spite of its phenomenally rigid and minute caste-system and the elaboration of its religious ritual, which the orthodox follow closely even though the unorthodox treat it with utter indifference Instead of criticising Muslims and acting as their mentors, Hindu leaders could well have set about reforming and reorganising Hindu Society. But with Lalaji charity does not begin at home, and his first beneficence was directed

towards the Muslims when he assailed them in a series of ten articles contributed simultaneously to several daily newspapers, the first of which appeared towards the end of November last. Then he began to contribute to the *Hindustan Times*, which had now become the property of the leader of Hindu Sangthan, Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya, a series of vigorous articles critical of the Swaraj Party. These were followed by a still more vigorous Presidential Address delivered in connection with the Hindu Mahasabha and its branches, and then came the series of articles "From Ravi to Brahmputra" contributed to *Hindustan Times* in which Lalaji surveyed the Hindu world in its relation to the Muslims.

Political Pedagogy

All this was but a prologue to the real theme of self-revelation to be taken up week after week in the columns of a *Review* of his own in which he announced he would impart education in politics and in political leadership to Indians. After criticising other political leaders in his Urdu organ, the *Bande Mataram*, in its issue of 26th June, Lalaji informed the youth of India that he had now resolved to give them the true milk of the political gospel in his English weekly *Review*, of which he asked them to preserve the entire file, since he hoped that this *Review* would bring to them "true light not only concerning Indian politics but also concerning the politics of the world, and they would become acquainted not only in theory but also in practice with all the secrets (or mysteries) of politics." This review was designed to be "a good political pedagogue." It is at last out, the first issue having been published on the 15th July. So far five issues have appeared, and although we were unable to obtain the second issue until very recently, we have carefully gone through the other four. Whether our enterprising contemporary would or would not bring "the true light not only concerning Indian politics but also concerning the politics of the world" and whether India's young men would or would not "become acquainted not only in theory but also in practice with all the secrects (or mysteries) of politics," it will certainly provide them with a good deal of

self-revelation on the part of the would-be political pedagogue of India and the East.

"There is no leader but Lalaji" should more appropriately have been entitled "myself,"—if not "I by itself I"—published in the first issue of the *People* over the *facsimile* of Lala Lajpat Rai, contains an attempt at iconoclasm. But, taken in conjunction with the earlier self-revelation in the columns of the *Bande Mataram* (not to mention the still earlier and expensive self-revelation in the series of articles and addresses that we have mentioned), and also with much that had since appeared over the initial "L.R." in the issues we have so far receeived, the attempt at iconoclasm is not only an attempt but is a double attempt. It is an attempt at breaking up that idol of the people, Mahatma Gandhi, and other comparatively minor idols, and also an attempt at setting up another idol of the people who is none other than the possessor of the initial "L.R." It is a quasi-Muslim credo, for it not only denies other gods but also sets up in the place of numerous false seeds scattered like nine pins the true and only deity worthy of worship—"L.R." "I believe in free thinking" is an excellent profession of faith. But few will follow this faith if the corollary is to be : "I alone shall think freely," and others are to remain "intellectual parasites" living on the intellectual food provided week after week by the editor of the *People* acting as the host. "I believe in freethinking. I also believe in discipline and obedience to true leadership." This is what the Lalaji tells us. But the self-revealing Lalaji compels us to read between the lines. And I am the only true leader, the others being all false, in particular the so-called Mahatma, who has brought us nothing but ruin during the last four or five years.

Those who pretend to think that we bear particular ill-will to Lalaji and are only caricaturing and lampooning him, instead of painting a portrait according to life will do well to read the following extract from the "canon's opening roar" in the first article of the first issue of the *People*, and to say if this is not an attempt to caricature and lampoon Mahatma

Gandhi : and those who have recognised in him a true leader worthy of being followed by a well disciplined nation in obedience to the call of Truth itself. Here is Lalaji's furious onset :

> "Melodrama and an excess of sentimentality have no place in politics. For some time we have been busy making experiments with schemes which could not possibly be carried out without an immediate radical change in human nature. Politics deal primarily and essentially with the facts of a nation's life and the possibilities of its progresses in the light of them. Human nature cannot be changed in months and years. You may require decades, even centuries, for that. Prophets and dreamers and visionaries are the salt of the earth. The world would be poor without them. But a campaign of political emancipation of a nation under foreign rule imposed and maintained at the point of the bayonet cannot be based on an attempt to change human nature quickly. Such attempts are bound to fail and end in disastrous action."

If this is not enough, read what has gone before.

> "I am afraid that last four or five years have been a period of intellectual laziness on our part. We have been rather obsessed by the idea of not weakening the influence of our leaders, and have let the work of leading be done by one or a very few men. The result is that after a brief period of great activity, we are now passing through a period of reaction to which laziness, indolence, unwillingness to think and a fear of unpopularity add their own forces. Time has come when the nation should be led out of these habits of sloth and inactivity."

The "Double Attempt"

Is this not the "double attempt" to which we have alluded, the attempt to break other idols, and particularly that idol of the people, Mahatma Gandhi, and set up for the people's worship the idol of Lala Lajpat Rai himself? What is the

"Melodrama" and "and "excess of sentimentality" to which Lalaji alludes if he does not mean the self-purification, through fasts and prayers of the originator of the Satyagraha movement, or rather every prophet, sage and seer's doctrine of love ? What are the experiments with schemes which could not possibly be carried out without an immediate radical change in human nature, other than the Mahatma's preparation for Civil Disobedience, with his insistence on the word "Civil" and his rigid adherence to non-violence in thought, word and deed ? And who but the Mahatma himself is the dreamer and the visionary whose class is the salt of the earth, and without whom the world would be poor, but who must not poke his saintly nose in a "campaign of political emancipation," and must leave it to the worldly wise leadership of men like the Lalaji ? Is it any other than the new era inaugurated since "the coming of the Mahatma," which put an end, at least for a time, to the sham and hypocrisy and cant of our political gatherings, and about which the present writer said in his address as the President of the Indian National Congress at Concanada that "there was no longer a plethora of the speeches sugesstive of midnight oil," full of sound and fury, signifying nothing, and there was a new earnestness which indicated that the resolutions of the Congress were resolutions indeed, in the sense that the resolution was resolved to act, —is it any other than this era of "initiation, courage, braving dangers and taking risks," to use Lalaji's own words, for which he pretends to pine, as if "the coming of the Mahatma" deprived us of them ?—is it any other era than this about which he says, "I am afraid the last four or five years have been a period of intellectual laziness on our part. We have been rather obsessed by the idea of not weakening the influence of our leaders and have the work of *leading be done by one or a very few men* ?"

"Willing to Wound and yet Afraid to Strike"

We ask, what difference is there between this and the C P. undermine Mahatma Gandhi's influence—between this and Baha Saheb Paranjpye's speech at the A.I.C.C. meeting at

Ahmedabad last year in which he told the Mahatma that there were five and a half millions of Sadhus in India with whom he was better fitted to keep company than to lead such *soi disant* disciples of Tilak, the practical politician—between this and Mr. Deshmukh's courteous invitations to the Mahatma to get out of the Congress? What difference is there between the statement of Lala Lajpat Rai as to the purpose he has in view in publishing the *People* and those other fulminators against Mahatma Gandhi, of course except that Lalaji's well-known lack of courage in letting us know what is really in his heart. We do dot know if the Punjabi Pedagogue of Politics reads poetry also, and has ever read in the polished satire of Pope the description of "Attecus" who was Addison in real life. It should interest him to read of men who—

> "Damn with faint praise, assent with cill leer,
> And without sneering teach the rest to sneer.
> Willing to wound and yet afraid to strike,
> Just hint a fault and hesitate dislike."

Lalaji's disguise of his attitude is, however, not so subtle. In the Punjab they are far too downright to be really subtle, though they do not always admit all that they feel and even say in so many words.

The Thirty-nine Articles of the Lalaji's Political Church

Evidently others besides ourselves also suspected that Lalaji was out to dethrone and depose Mahatmaji, and even to spare Malviyaji, an idol of the Hindus of the North, and so Lalaji has indulged in some more self-relvelations though he did not certainly intend this time to reveal his real self—and published the Thirty-nine articles of his Political Church in the *People* of the 26th July under the heading "My Political Creed." It will interest our readers to read the following extract:

"My relations with Mahatma Gandhi are of the most cordial and pleasant nature. We differ very widely in principles and programmes, and even more so in tempera-

ment and behaviour. He is an ideal friend. He has written to assure me that he considers me to be 'one of his dearest friends' and that, since he 'discovered me at Nagpur,' has had no occasion to change his opinion of me. I am sure if I have misread his letter he will correct me. My attitude towards him is one of unbounded love, admiration and respect, he and Malviyaji are for me the two greatest personalities in the country. I differ from both not noly in temperament but also in principles and programmes. Yet I love and respect them both as I love no other in public and in private. But the idea of displacing them in the leadership of the country can never enter my brain. In spite of all my love and admiration for them I consider them to be only fallible human beings who are not far from blame or error. In my judgment they do at times commit blunders. And if I am anywhere near them I do not hesitate to tell them so, or to send them a message to that effect. What to some may appear "insolence", "impertinence," or "impudence," seems to me be a clean duty and an act of the greatest friendship. I do not care what other people think or say, so long as the sweetness and forbearance of these friends allows me to do my duty in my own imperfect and at times rude way. They know my motives and understand me as perhaps no one else does. I am content with that."

Unbounded "Love" or Unbounded "Cant" ?

We rejoice to learn that Lalaji's "relations with Mahatma Gandhi are of the most cordial and pleasant nature," and that Mahatmaji considers him to be "one of his dearest friends," but it does not disprove his obvious desire to displace him in the leadership of the country, in spite of his flat denial of it ; and it speaks volumes for the Mahatma's admitted "sweetness, forbearance and patience" that Lalaji's equally admitted "rude way" of doing what he tells us is his "duty" does not affect those relations "of the most cordial and pleasant natur.e" Few

will pretend to say that their attitude towards any man is of "*unbounded love*, admiration and respect." But such is Lalaji's attitude towards the Mahatma. Well, here are some passages from Lalaji's article contributed to the *Leader* of March entitled "Mr. Gandhi on the Hindu-Muslim Question," expressive of his "unbounded love, admiration and respect." After reading them most people would call it unbounded cant and hypocrisy for the author of these passages to profess "*unbounded love*, admiration and respect."

Here are these precious passages :

"I have read Mahatma Gandhi's latest article on the Hindu-Muslim question, and I regret to say that I have not been very much impressed either with its logicality or its general soundness. *Mahatma Gandhi's protestation about his being an unbiassed observer leaves a bad taste in the mouth.* Evidently he refers to the impression, widespread among the Hindus, that in the Hindu-Muslim question, he starts with a bias in favour of the Muslims. Rightly or wrongly the impression is there, *and no amount of protestation by Mahatma Gandhi to the contrary will remove it unless he suits his conduct to his profession.* My love, admiration and respect for Mahatma Gandhi is more genuine than that of some other men who, whilst exploiting him in public for their party purposes, do not hesitate to ridicule him in private. But with all my *love, admiration and respect for him I cannot help thinking that Mahatmaji is not entirely unbiassed in his treatment of the Hindu-Muslim question.* The bias is unconscious and even well-intentioned, but it is there.

"There is one thing more to complain about his conclusions on this question. He comes *out with his definite, positive opinions without studying different sections of the question in all their bearing and without trying to collect facts relating thereto. This happens for the simple reason that he is always in a hurry to have matters settled finally without giving people time to properly study and think over them. When he*

stumbles over facts not known to him before, he at once comes out with on exclamation.

"Yet he would neither take time nor give time sufficient to master facts. I am extiemely sorry to observe that while the Non-co-operation movement brought about immense awakening in the masses, Mahatma Gandhi's cry of "Swaraj within one year" did hurt us politically. In fact, I do not hesitate to say that Non-co-operation campaign has been one of the portent causes of increasing friction between the Hindus and Muslims.... We have done many a stupid thing during the past five years by the rushing through and by the assumption that one or a few wise men can do the whole thinking for us.. . I know there are many leaders in different parts of India who think on these lines, but they would not permit me to use their names. Being a timid man, I take the entire risk of this unpleasantness."

Some "Facts" of our National Life

We think we have given enough proof of "the unbounded love, admiration and respect" of Lala Lajpat Rai for Mahatma Gandhi and in support of his profession that "the idea of displancing him in the leadership of the country can never enter in his brain." No one can doubt after this that his chief desire is to displace Mahatma Gandhi in his leadership and to give to Indians, which means to the Hindus, for even he must despair of Muslims—a true lead himself. We agree with him that "politics deal primarily and essentially with facts of a nation's life, and the possibilities of its progress in the light of them." But has he never considered what are the facts of the Indian national life ? We shall be only too ready to do without "prophets and dreamers and visionaries," and particularly without Mahatma Gandhi, even though Lalaji calls them "the salt of the earth," and says that "the world would be poor without them." Nation's life and the possibilities of its progress in the light of them, and the character of our own brand of "human nature," make it all likely that we could do without such quick changes. But is not the crawling lane of "the facts

of our national life," after all, the courage that it showed in Lalaji's own province in killing and burning British bank managers and assaulting British women ? Are not the cat and dog quarrels of Hindus and Muslims, particularly in his own province, the facts of our nation's life ? If Lala Lajpat Rai can wait for decades and even centuries for changing such "human nature," he is quite welcome to do that. So far as the Mahatma and those who believe in him and follow him are concerned, such cowardice and such quarrels must not continue for a single day, let alone for months and years. True, it may take months and years to get rid of them, and even decades or centuries if men like Lalaji are to lead the two communities. But we must trust "human nature" better than Lalaji does, and must continue to appeal to the manhood of India and to Indian patriotism to get rid of them in a single night. It may not be possible to do far better in this respect than Lalaji's Punjab has yet done, and Swaraj can be won in one year if even a small portion of the 320 millions can be induced to be more brave and more brotherly. Is this impossible ? Yes, if men like Lala Lajpat Rai are to lead the youth of India. No, if it is men like Mahatma Gandhi that are to lead. That is the conclusion at which we have arrived and to which we give expression though it be, like Lalaji, in a rude way."

Tried and Found Wanting

Lala Lajpat Rai and his tribe of leaders were given a long enough trial in leading a "campaign of political emancipation." They were all "practical politicians," and not those abject beings, "prophets and dreamers and visionaries," whose chief fault is that they can see beyond their noses, while the "practical politicians" cannot see very clearly even what lies under their very noses. In those days the Congress, as it actually existed, was in accord with Lala Lajpat Rai's ideal. It worked as if all the 300 millions of India's population had no religion. It not only never took up any course such as the defence of the Khilafat as a national cause, but continued to ignore the existence of the community that had ruled some part or other of India, and nearly almost the whole of it, for close upon twelve

centuries. For this and for other reasons the Muslims as a community kept entirely aloof. So did the Sikhs and the Mahrattas and Rajputs and other people of military traditions. Except for a handful of Parsees, it was a Congress representative only of such portions of the Hindu community as had taken to English education and filled Government offices and the law courts. Except for that brave champion of Indian freedom by his own sufferings, and some others who were equally ready to suffer, though actually they were not called upon to suffer, leading Congressmen were gentlemen of the independent and moderate type who acted as if a nation could be given freedom by the resolutions of debating societies. All honour to Lala Lajpat Rai himself that he bore his deposition, which was such a novel thing in those days, without flinching. These leaders were certainly not in touch with the masses in anything like the sense in which Mahatma Gandhi is in touch with them to-day. Apart from occasional protests made on sparsely attended "Public Meetings" held in the chambers of some local or provincial association, they met once a year in the Congress for three days in the Christmas week for Lala Lajpat Rai's "campaign of political emancipation of a nation under foreign rule imposed and maintained at the point of the bayonet," and called it "the week of sacrifice." This is what used to take place before "the coming of the Mahatma"—and after Lalaji had come. Is Lalaji willing to go back to that period if he is so dissatisfied with "the work of leading done by one or a very few men" like Mahatma Gandhi, Deshbandhu Dass, Hakeem Ajmal Khan, Pandit Moti Lal Nehru and Maulana Shaukat Ali ? The whole output of one Congress in the first generation of thirty years not losing sight of the educative work it did among the classes that have received English education, could not equal the work it did in the three sessions of Amritsar, Nagpur and Ahmedabad and the special Session of Calcutta—in spite of Lala Lajpat Rai's own hesitancy.

"It was time to try another road"

When at Nagpur Mr. Jinnah, who opposed the creed of the Congress, asked the Non-co-operators why a change in the

nation's political outlook was necessary, the present writer was tempted to repeat a story he heard in England, even though it was fit for a smoking room than for the Subjects Committee of the Congress. Lala Lajpat Rai tempts him to repeat the story here. A salvation army preacher was once preaching in Piccadilly in the neighbourhood of midnight and asking the people to follow him on the road to salvation. A seasoned club-man, who had dined only too well and was far from unfamiliar with the ways of Piccadilly, stopped on his way home from his club when he heard such a novel sermon from a prominent pulpit in Piccadilly. He raised his eyes, surveyed the whole group of preacher and congregation, and with the smile of the polite and the curious asked the man who wanted all to follow him on the road to salvation. "Beg pardon, but might I ask whether you have yourself trod on this road to salvation ?" The salvation army preacher zealously replied : "Yes, Sir, I have trod that path for full fifteen years !" On this the club-man of Piccadilly said, "Ah ! is that so ? Well, if after full fifteen years' treading the road to salvation has brought you at this hour to Piccadilly, if I were you I would try another road !" Lala Lajpat Rai's Hindu Congress, before entering which every man had to leave his religion behind, or, at least, treat it like his private tooth brush, had brought us to the Crawling Lane of Amritsar and it was time that Mahatma Gandhi, dreamer and visionary though he be, should take the lead even in a "campaign of political emancipation," and try another road than the one of irreligion and playing at politics.

Lalaji's Enviable Detachment after the tide of Popularity Receded

If Lala Lajpat Rai writes as if he was nothing but a critic of the mad ways of the Mahatma during the last five years, and had not been tried along with his tribe all those years before Amritsar and found wanting, he writes with equally enviable detachment of the last five years themselves, although he was as much responsible for them as Mahatma Gandhi or any other Non-co-operator. It is true he vehemently opposed

the Mahatma at the special session at Calcutta at which he presided, and was inclined to do the same at Nagpur, but became evidently shy in the very Students' Conference over which he presided in spite of his disdaining to-day to entertain any "fear of unpopularity." But when Deshbandu Dass broke away from him in spite of their arrangement at Benares only a few weeks earlier, all his scruples against Non-co-operation and the Mahatma's mad methods evaporated into thin air, and he was at least willing, if not anxious, to second the Non-co-operation resolution before sixteen thousands of his fellow-countrymen Can he point to a single occasion before the *Sangathan* movement when he opposed any of the methods followed by Mahatma Gandhi ? The fact is that, like so many of the back-sliding men of his province, he deserted the Mahatma the movement the tide of popular favour began to ebb away from the Non-co-operation movement and began to flow in the direction of communal separation. However uncongenial the rigours of Non-co-operation may have been to him, he was willing enough to ride on the crest of the wave when Non-co-operation was at full-flood. But when communal dissensions made it possible for him to lead the Hindus, he transferred his allegiance and his affections from the Non-co-operating Congress of Mahatma Gandhi to the Hindu Mahasabha of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. Lala Lajpat Rai is, therefore, only an *edition de lux* of the "leaders" of the Punjab and seeks but the plaudits which partisans offer as homage to the leader of the hour.

A Misnomer

Well, he has made his choice between history and the passing hour, and if so be it ; so let it be. But let him not pretend that he in any way represents the people of India. Lalaji's new organ wherein he indulges in self-revelation, which some people would call self-advertisement, should not have been named the *People*. Where the first person singular is likely to be in constant use it would be better for Lalaji to buy the copyright from our Allahabad contemporary and to call

his journal the *Leader*. That certainly is more in keeping with the gentleman who gives to the compilers of the Telephone Directory at Delhi his name and address as "Lajpat Rai Lala (All-India Leader), Near Lady Hardinge Medical College."

At Cocanada one of the U.P. delegates was asked in a certain street of the town by a group of visitors whether he was a leader. This delegate had a sense of humour, and instead of denying the mild impeachment, he replied : "In my district I am certainly a leader, and I am trying hard to become a leader in the province also. But truth compels me to say that I am not an All-India leader." But it is a novel thing even for All-India leaders to advertise the fact in telephone directories.

To do the Lalaji justice, it was perhaps some secretary who is responsible for this classification of leadership finding its way into the Delhi Telephone Directory. But, when can any "All-India Leader" say that he is not his secretary keeper ? As a rule, nobody is hero to his valet or to his wife, and perhaps secretaries come somewhere between valet and wives. Our secretaries proclaim us to be heroes only when they can be sure that the advertisement would please us. It may be that some secretaries think that the halo is big enough for a companion star as well as the moon, and, therefore, cannot rest unless their moon gets its halo around it and allows the secretary's star to slip into the halo. But we have the secretaries that we deserve. Who can imagine Mahadeo Desai to ask the compilers of a telephone directory to print therein that "Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, Mahatma," is an "All-India Leader ?" Nevertheless Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi is both a Mahatma and the only "All-India Leader" in spite of Lala Lajpat Rai's frantic efforts to displace him.

"Free Thought" or "Slave Mentality ?

So far we have examined Lala Lajpat Rai's motives behind his professed purposes in publishing the *People*. Let us now examine a little the reasons that he has advanced in support of his purpose. Lala Lajpat Rai's main reason appears to be that

"the coming of the Mahatma" led to the loss of a thinking few, that it has induced intellectual laziness, indolence, unwillingness to think and a fear of unpopularity," that the rigid discipline that followed has gone to the extent of "strangling free thought and stifling free discussion," and the result has been "intellectual stagnation," that "we have been rather obsessed by the idea of not weakening the influence of our leaders, and have let the work of leading be done by one of very few men," which has resulted in "habits of sloth and inactivity." Now, is this a fact ? Let us examine. The most patent fact of our national life was the slave mentality which made our educated classes think that we ourselves were capable of doing nothing, that the British ways were indispensable ; that "the British connection," even if it continued to be what it has been ever since the first steps of British rule is a "dispensation of Providence and unalterable like the laws of Nature. Just as a snake by its fixed gaze binds a spell on its intended victim, or as the snake-charmer binds a spell by his ground flute on the snake itself which he means to make his captive for the sake of his daily bread, our masters had hypnotised our educated classes by the education imparted us in our schools and colleges."

The present writer must confess that nobody had been more effectively under the spell of the British than he himself when he wrote in the *Comrade* of the 12th August 1914, soon after the outbreak of the Great War, that "There are still some people among Indians themselves, and though they do not advertise the offer of their personal services to the Government, whatever influence they possess with the people would be used to decrease rather than increase the Government's embarrassment. They would offer no better guarantee than this that *they regard India's connection with Great Britain at the present stage of India's growth indispensable*, and we are sure the less lofty motive of self-interest wou'd wear better and stand the strain of circumstances longer than the liployalty of Jee-Hazurs." After recounting a large number of occasions on which Britain

had betrayed India and the Muslims of India, the present writer had said :

"Irrespective of any or all the considerations, or rather because *we have carefully weighed them all against the one supreme consideration, our need of England and her tutelage at the present stage of our national and communal growth*, and found the good exceeding by great deal her evil, we shall remain loyal with a sincere devotion and an unbought submission, and whether she crushes the naval power of Germany and becomes a dictator to Europe, or the last ship of her mighty Armada sinks in the North Sea and her last soldier falls down and dies round Liege or London."

Such was the spell that Britain had cast round educated Indians, including such of them as could not by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as sycophants and servile. It was this spell cast on the intellect of India that had totally paralysed us, and it was Mahatma Gandhi who broke this spell and charged this slave mentality by thinking freely and teaching others to think freely too. It was through his precept and practice that we learnt the lesson of "initiative, courage, braving dangers, taking risk" which, as Lala Lajpat Rai rightly says, "all form a part of the moral courage which an independent nation is called upon to bring into play." When the Mahatma was made by the nation its Dictator at Ahmedabad, the present writer said to his companion in the prison ward, where he then was, that he alone could be trusted as Dictator because he is the only one of our leaders who hates to dictate. Who, then, is the man who can come forward and dare to say that Mahatma set a seal over his brain and stopped him from thinking ? As a matter of fact, it was only incidentally that the Mahatma's movement would have paralysed the administration. As the present writer said in his Cocanada Presidential Address, "it did not directly aim at the paralysis of others, its direct aim was to remove our own paralysis." And yet it is the author of such a movement who is accused of having brought about the result that "the great part of the thinking

community was relieved of the duty of vigorous thinking" and, in its place, was substituted "intellectual parasitism or intellectual laziness."

It is all very well to write in this fashion, but we challenge Lala Lajpat Rai to produce even a couple of examples of free and vigorous thinking from his own speeches and writings and those of the other leaders who shared with him the political guidance of India before the 1919 Congress to equal Mahatma Gandhi's restatement of the doctrines of Non-violent Non-co-operation and Civil Disobedience, and his rediscovery of the neglected Charkha—which had sunk even from the position of furniture to that of fuel—and his rehabilitation of it as the most important weapon in our nation's armoury. Like all great and original thoughts the rediscovery of the Charkha was such a simple thing that through its very simplicity it has attracted greatness. The fact is that the educated classes of India have so got used to long and elaborate foreign prescriptions that they turn up their educated noses at a simple remedy like the Charkha prescribed by a Vaidya of their own. Now except for Lokmanya Tilak's rediscovery of the great truth that "Swaraj is our birth-right," the political thinking of the previous thirty years had produced very little indeed, if we compare it to the great truths enunciated or restarted by Mahatma Gandhi and yet Lalaji is not content.

Lalaji's Idea of Discipline

And to what does he attribute this freezing up of the current of political thought at its source. To the rigid discipline that had been imposed by the Mahatma. As we explained in our series of articles entitled "The Day of our Defeat," ever since the days of Moses and Aaron were deserted by the undisciplined rabble of the Israelites has any leader of a people suffered such a defeat and so much humiliation through indiscipline as Mahatma Gandhi ?

The defection of the Swarajists at Gaya did not demonstrate any very shocking discipline After the Gaya session some nine months were wasted in vain efforts to keep the Swarajists

within the bounds of Mahatmaji's Non-co-operation, and when the present writer and Lalaji were released about the same time, they had both to decide what advice to offer to the Congress. Lalaji from his sick-bed pleaded for "unity at the cost of "discipline," and the present writer did his "bit" and succeeded beyond his expectations in inducing the No-changers at the special session at Delhi to permit the Swarajists to have their own way. This does not look like maintaining the stronghold of "discipline" on free thinking and free action. At Cocanada he and Maulana Shaukat Ali brought round most of the No-change stalwarts who could have easily defeated the Swarajists there, if not at Delhi also, to confirm the Delhi concession. Mahatma Gandhi, when he was at last fit to take part in our national deliberations, did seek to restore discipline at the A.I.C.C. meeting at Ahmedabad, against the advice of some of the staunchest No-changers. But before the meetings concluded he gave up the attempt in the frankest fashion, and followed it up soon after his second convalescence in November with the Calcutta "Pact" which was still greater concession than that of Delhi or Cocanada. And now he has absolved the Swarajists, a wing of whom has persistently opposed the spinning franchise, and few of whom could be said to have helped the Mahatma in popularising spinning, from their honourable obligation undertaken at Calcutta. Is this the manifestation of thought-crushing discipline as the Lalaji would have us believe, or is it, on the contrary, the manifestation of a graceful generosity unknown in Western politics, and of which Lalaji at least is wholly incapable? Any stick is good enough to beat the Mahatma with, and Lalaji who is evidently as incapable of appreciating such generosity on the part of the Mahatma as he is incapable of initiating it, adds this graceful act of the generous Mahatma also to the score he has long been keeping of the Mahatma's "failures" and of the experiments he has tried and then abandoned. Concession after concession to human weakness is to Lalaji—who writes as if he was in no way responsible for them, though he certainly was as much responsible as any other co-worker of the Mahatma—an experiment tried in a hurry, and abandoned in

a hurry, all because the mad and impatient and unthinking Mahatma would neither take time himself to study things and to think nor give time to others. But the leader of the Swarajists is not incapable of appreciating such unexampled generosity in a political leader who differs in such vital matters from another political leader and yet surrenders so gracefully to the latter and to his party. Pandit Motilal Nehru, from whom too we greatly differ, has evidently been touched by the future. The Swarajists,—except perhaps those of the Deshmukh and Moonje and Kelkar type,—may sooner or later come round, but what hope is there for the Lalaji's following in the Punjab which knows no discipline except that of the Sangathan and the Hindu Mahasabha, flavoured by that of Arya Samajism ? In Lalaji's province the Hindus and the Muslims exist only to try to defeat each other, and for Lalaji, the leader of the Punjab—without prejudice to his All-India Leadership to talk of a discipline that "strangles free thought and stifles free discussion" is for a rebel to talk of the rigours of loyalty !

Lalaji's Abhorrence of Religion in Politics

A paragraph or two about Lalaji's abhorrence of religion in Non-co-operation politics and what we have done. The Lalaji does not tell us where religion has come in, but we think we can guess. The religion which must not enter politics is in particular the religion of the Muslims. His first objection is to the respect shown by the Mahatma and those who followed him for the religious obligations of the Muslims in the matter of Khilafat. Now, for all the help that Lalaji and the likes of his have rendered to the Khilafat cause, it may not have been rendered at all. All honour to the many Hindus who helped the Muslims in their hour of need and no Muslim should forget the debt he owes, in particular, to Mahatma Gandhi, though we regret to have to say that only too many acted at Kohat and elsewhere as if that debt did not exist, or had been wiped away. But let Lalaji remember that even if the Mahatmaji had not come so generously and warm-heartedly to Muslim help, the Muslims, or rather such of them

as really took it up, would not have given up the Khilafat cause. Moreover, it was principally the Khilafat movement that vitalized the Congress and led to Non-co-operation. The Punjab wrongs are still unredressed, but far fewer Punjabis seem to have remembered them during the last two years than the Muslims who remember even to-day the unredeemed Jazeerat-ul-Arab. There is an undying vitality in the cause as long as there is any vitality in Islam, but there seems to be far less vitality in the cause of redressing Punjab wrongs mainly because in the Punjab more than in other Provinces there is less desire to have common wrongs redressed than communal wrongs, real and fancied, and this in its turn is due to the leadership of Punjab's Hindus and Muslim leaders, including the Lalaji himself. But we are perhaps digressing. The question is, could or could not the Congress, while claiming to be National and Indian ignore the betrayal of Indian Muslims by Britain in the treaty she was imposing on the *Sangathan* of Islam known as the Khilafat ? Muslim loyalty to Britain was conditional on Britain's respecting every religious obligation of a Muslim, just as we believe Hindu loyalty is conditional on her respecting every religious obligation of a Hindu. And the freedom of the Jazeerat-ul-Arab from non-Muslim control, and the maintenance of the requisite degree of the temporal power of the Khilafat for guarding Islam's borders and for enforcing Islamic discipline within them had always been two of the principal religious obligations of the Muslims of the world. Largely with Indian and Muslim aid, Britain had compelled the Turks to accept the armistice. India and the Muslims should have been called to make the peace just as they had been called to wage the war. The Muslims of India could not consent to the transfer of their Holy Land to non Muslim control, to the destruction of the temporal power of the Khilafat and to the reduction of the Khilafat to the position of a petty Emir controlled in every direction by the enemies of Islam, and living on the sufference of Christian Powers. As the present writer said, addressing Mahatma Gandhi at the Amritsar Khilafat Conference, held immediately after his (the

author's) release and his brother's in the last days of 1919, Indian Muslims had no use for the citizenship of the Empire if it was to be at the sacrifice of the Khilafat and of the freedom of Islam's Holy Land, and, in fact, of everything that they held dearer than life itself. Could India co-operate with her foreign rulers after the betrayal of seventy millions of her second largest community ? The Mahatma said, "no," but it is evident now that Lala Lajpat Rai would have liked to say "yes," though, characteristically enough, he did not when he had every opportunity of saying it.

Islam or "Pan-Islamism"

Well, he can say "yes," even now, but if he can attract one honest Muslim to his "National" Congress after that we are very much mistaken. These are the terms on which alone a Muslim can agree to be a member of any nation. Men like Lalaji and that inveterate enemy of "Pan-Islamism," Mr. Bepin Chander Pal, may not like these terms, and to many other Hindus too they may seem very peculiar terms, just as to Muslims and Christians and others whose idea of religion is that of a Universal Religion, the idea of Hinduism, the religion of the inhabitants of Hindustan, is a peculiar idea. But we must take things as we find them, and Muslim co-operation in an Indian nationality can only be had on terms we have mentioned. Lalaji and those who think with him and take it or have it, we cannot alter the terms, for what our ill-informed critics call Pan-Islamism is nothing more and nothing less than Islam itself, the supernational *Sangathan* of Muslims in five continents. To the Lalaji a larger share in the administration of community, or the development of India's industries and other such things, may mean Swaraj. To us, for Hindus, no less than for Muslims, Swaraj is nothing if it does not include *Swadharma*.

FREEDOM OR DEATH*

Mr. Chairman, may I exercise the privilege of the invalid and remain seated ? My friend, Dr. Moonje, has explained his

*Speech at the Fourth Plenary Session of the Round Table Conference held in London on 19 November, 1930.

position as to how he has been called a traitor to his country. I think we are bracketed together here again. As he knows very well, on the day when he and I were to depart from India black flags were to be flown to wish us Godspeed, and the wishes of people with whom we had been working all these years were that the boat "Viceroy of India" might prove very unseaworthy. Even when I came to this country one newspaper in England which I have helped to stabilise financially—I am very glad to see it has a million sale today—the "Daily Herald" published my photograph and called me a convert—I suppose a convert from patriotism to treachery. There is in Parliament, besides the Conservative peer who spoke yesterday frankly and sincerely, another very Conservative gentleman, who was my tutor professor at Oxford, Sir Charles Oman and it is from history that I quote one short sentence which formed the subject of one of the questions asked us in the Indian Civil Service Examination for which I appeared and failed: "The Saracen alone it was impossible to convert." I did not claim to have in me Aryan blood like all the white people here and Dr Moonje. I have the blood in me which my Lord Reading who sent me to prison—has perhaps running in his veins. I am a Semite and if he has not been converted from Zionism, I too am not converted from Islam, and my anchor holds. I am the only person belonging to my party who has been selected by His Excellency the Viceroy, or the Government of His Majesty here, or whoever it is who has appointed these wonderful Delegates. Whose Delegates we are we do not know. I do not pretend to represent anybody; but I will say this much, I feel certain that when you have heard me—I hope patiently—you will say that I am right in my claim, that at least I am not misrepresenting myself, and I think that should be enough. In politics there is too much misrepresentation even of oneself.

In reply to Lord Peel, I will only quote to him from an English poet as I did when we were going through the lobby. I said, "I hope your Lordship is a Conservative and will remain a Conservative; because the only definition that I read of a Conservative was in Tennyson, who said:

"He is the best Conservative
Who lops the mouldered branch away."

I think those ideas which Lord Peel expressed, very sincerely and frankly, really represent the mouldered branch which should be lopped away. This is my only answer to him. As regards the other Conservative, our own Prince from India, namely His Highness the Maharaja Sahib of Rewa, I am not quite sure about his conservatism. If he takes Burke to be a Conservative, and quotes him at the end of his speech, I would say : "Be a Conservative and stick to it, for, quoting Burke, His Highness said : "Small minds and large empires go ill together". If the British Empire—call it Empire, call it commonwealth of Nations, whatever you choose to call it I do not care—if the British Empire desires to remain big, the small minds that have been visible and audible only too long must disappear. If you had followed Burke, you would not have lost America, and you would not be talking of parity today in building warships. There should be much more talk of charity. And you would not have all those debts to pay. You would not have all that worry. You would not have to go so often to Geneva to the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference. How long that preparation is going to take Heaven only knows. All these things came in because you forgot your greatest politician, your greatest statesman, who was the man who, in the House of Commons, was called the "dinner bell," because when Burke got up to speak you all left and went to the dining room. You sill do that to people who are like Burke, and I therefore say—and I quote him once again —"Men, not measures." I do not care what constitution you prepare for us but all would be well if you have got one man in England who is a real man

"Oh God ! for a man with heart, head, hand,
Like some of the simple great ones gone
For ever and ever by.
One still strong man in a blatant land,
Whatever they call him, what care I ?

Aristocrat, autocrat, democrat—one
Who can rule and dare not lie."

I hope my old friend Mr. MacDonald will at least prove the man to rule, and that he would not dare to lie to his own Party, to his own conscience, to his dead wife, and to his living country ; and if you people of all parties assist him, as you should, I assure you we will make history. But even more than I trust my old friend Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, I, a republican, make this confession, that I place my trust in the man—I call him a man; because "a man's a man for that" —who inaugurated this Conference in the Gallery of the House of Lords, whose name is George. Whether you call him His Majesty or whatever you call him, he is a man ! He knows India better than any of his Ministers, past or present, and I am looking up to him to do justice to the 320 millions who constitute one-fifth of the whole of humanity, and I am strengthened in that belief by the wonderful patriotism shown by the Princes arrayed over there, the conservative element in India. It must be a revelation to my Lord Peel and to my Lord Reading ; it is no revelation to me. I am again a unique person. While I am a British subject—though I was yet being excluded from the Indian Civil Service Examination because they said I was not a "natural born British subject" provisionally they admitted me, till evidence from my mother came in, and they finally admitted me—I happen also to be subject of an Indian State, and probably in that respect too I am a unique person in this Conference. I was born in a State; I have served in that State. I have served in another State, Baroda—my master, the Gaekwar is here : I ate his salt for seven years—and when I was dying two years ago it was an Indian Prince, His Highness of Alwar, who sent me at his own cost his own doctor here. When I was supposed to be going to die once more at Simla, it was a Prince, whom I was once about to being to teach as a private tutor, the Nawab Sahib of Bhopal, who exercised the truest hospitality—which the British are not yet exercising—he turned his guest-house into a hospital for me. The British will be extending their hospitality

to me in the letter as well as they are doing in the spirit, if they make me a free patient in every hospital that there is. When I was sent to Simla to the hospital I made judicious separation between two finances, a lady on one side and military officer on the other, who were to be married very shorly. I occupied a room between them ! Both were ailing. The lady asked our doctor, when she saw a strange looking Indian coming into the European quarters, "What is this old man ailing from". The doctor said. "Ask me rather what the old man is not ailing from". A man with my dilated heart ; with my approaching and recurrent blindness through retinitis ; with my once gangrened foot. with neuritis —this huge buling foot through oedema ; with albuminaria ; with diabetes, and the whole long list that I could give you if Colonel Gidney would not think I was becoming his rival as a medical man, I say no sane man with all these ailments would have travelled seven miles. And yet I have come seven thousand miles of land and sea because, where Islam and India are concerned, I am mad, and, as the "Daily Herald" puts it, I am a "convert" ; from a "rebel" against the Government, I have become a "traitor" to my country, and I am now working "with the Government". I say I can work even with the Devil if it is be, like this work, in the cause of God.

I hope you will forgive this long introduction about my ill-health and ailments and all sorts of things ; but the fact is that today the one purpose for which I came is this—that I want to go back to my country, if I can go back, with the substance of freedom in my hand. Otherwise I will not go back to a slave country. I would even prefer to die in a foreign country so long as it is a free country and if you do not give us freedom in India you will have to give me a grave here.

I begin with the Conservatives by thanking them. When I met Mr. Baldwin at the dinner which the Government hospitality provided for us, when I was really very ill and ought to have been in bed, I was watching for the cherrywood pipe, and, thank God, it came out. So I went to Mr. Baldwin,

and I said, "In two ways you have made history. Although a Conservative belonging to a party of the so-called idle rich, you have at least been human enough to establish this rule, that where only Coronas could be smoked after dinner an honest man could now bring out his shag, put it into a cherry-wood pipe, as I used to do at Oxford, and smoke it." But, as I told him, he has done another historic thing also. He has sent out a Conservative Viceroy of the type of Lord Irwin ; If any man has saved the British Empire today, it is that tall, thin Christian. If Lord Irwin was not there today, heaven only knows what would have happened. At least I would not be the "convert" I am supposed to be. We should not have been at this Round Table. It is for the sake of peace, friendship and freedom that we have come here, and I hope we shall go back with all that, if we do not, we go back into the ranks of fighters where we were ten years before. They may now call us traitors to the country. You may then call us rebels or outlaws. We do not care.

I have said something about His Excellency Lord Irwin, but I do not wish to associate all that with his Government. They have woefully mismanaged things. The only good point about there Despatch is that it has provided us with another "historic document". The Simon Commission's Report is not the only document we have to consider. The Despatch is a most disappointing document. This best thing we can do after it is to create our own "historic document" here. The best hearts and the best brains of two big countries are assembled here. Many who ought to have been here are still in gaol in India. Mr. Jayakar, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, and I tried our hands at peace-making between the Viceroy and Gandhiji, but we failed. I was the first in the field, but failed. I hope we shall not fail when we go back to our country this time, carrying with us the substance of freedom.

Lord Peel said, "Oh, yes, but when you go back to your country with a constitution such as you want, those people who are not co-operating will wrest it from your hands". Wrest it ! When I can fight the British I can fight the Indians too. But

give me something to fight for. Do not let me have to take back from here a charter of slavery and then expect me to fight my own people. I could not do it, and if I tried to do it, I should fail. But with freedom in our hands I would gladly go back to those in whose name my friend, Mr. Jayakar, spoke. He claimed to speak for Young India. I think he knows that, although I am older than him in years, I am a younger man in heart, in spirit, in temperament and in love of fighting. I was non-co-operating when Mr. Jayakar was still practising in the law courts. (Mr. Jayakar shook his head). Anyhow he was not in gaol with me. My brother and I were the very first to be sent to gaol by Lord Reading. I bear him no grudge for that, but I want the power also, when Lord Reading goes wrong again in India, to send him to gaol.

I have not come to ask for Dominion Status. I do not believe in the attainment of Dominion Status. The one thing to which I am committed is complete independence. In Madras in 1927, we passed a resolution making that our goal. In 1928, in the Convention of All Parties, the adoption of the Nehru Report Constitution was moved, the very first clause of which was about Dominion Status. Even my old secretary, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the President of the Congress today, was kept down by his father. There is a Persian proverb which says : "Be a dog, do not be a younger brother". And when you see my big brother over there, "seven feet by five", as Colonel Wedgwood called him, you can well believe, I believe, in this Persian proverb. In the case of Jawaharlal I would say, "Be a cat, do not be the son of your father". For it was his father who as President of the Congress, throttled poor Jawaharlal at Calcutta in 1928. Well I got up in his place, when he could not speak for complete independence, and I opposed the clause dealing with Dominion Status. But in 1929 I would not go further like Jawaharlal and make it my creed, because once we make it our creed in the Congress, we cannot admit anybody into the Congress who does not hold that creed. I liked to keep the door open for negotiation. I would not like to slam the door in he face of anybody. His Excellency Lord Irwin, a

Conservative Viceroy, was "the man on the spot". And he was sufficiently impressed by what he saw on the spot and came here. When we come to London we hear that everybody is appealing to "the man in the street". Whether "the man in the street" is ever heard or not, I do not Know ; but Lord Rathermore and Lord Beaverbrook and everybody else always talk about "the man in the street" as the final court of appeal. In India it is always "the man on the spot". Well, "the man on the spot" came here and he talked to the leading "man in the street", who is presiding here. I am sure he preached to the converted. They brought round Mr. Baldwin also ; they brought round some Conservatives ; they brought round everybody they could and made the announcement that Dominion Status was meant, when in 1917 they said "Responsible Government". That cleared the fog which had been created in a very memorable meeting of the Indian Legislative Assembly in 1924 by the Officer in charge of the Home Department at the time, who I am glad is present here today.

As I said two or three days ago, India has put on fifty-league boots. We are making forced marches which will astonish the world and we will not go back to India unless a new Dominion is born. If we go back to India without the birth of a new Dominion we shall go back, believe me, to a lost Dominion. We shall go back to an America. Then you will witness, not within the British Commonwealth or the British Empire, but outside it, with the Indian Princes, with Dr. Moonje, with Mr. Jayakar, with myself and my brother a Free and United States of India. It will be something more than that. As I wrote shortly after leaving Oxford long years ago, in India we shall have something better than an America, because we shall not only have a United States, but we shall have United Faiths.

> "Not like to like, but like in difference ;
> Self-reverent each and reverencing each ;
> Distinct in individualities,
> But like each other, e'en as those who love"

It is with these passions surging in our hearts that we have come here. It now depends upon our Conservative friends, upon our Radical friends, upon our Labour friends, and still more upon the one man whom I trust more in England than anybody else—His Majesty King George, the grandson of Victoria the Good, whose love for India nobody dare deny. Her whole life was the Magna Charta of India, and in her grandson's time history will be written again like this : "George III lost America. George V won India"!

We are told that there are difficulties. It is said, "Look at the States". But I come from the States, and I know they present no difficulty whatever. "Then there is the Army". Well what about the Army ? It is the biggest indictment against Great Britain that the Army is not ours today, and if you ever use that excuse of the Army you will condemn yourselves out of your own mouths. Let me tell you frankly and honestly, but in a friendly way, that your greatest sin was the emasculation of India.

I am glad to hear my friend, Dr. Moonje, say "Hear, hear". I was very sorry to hear him talk about our people being fired upon and therefore running away for a time and then coming back. We have 320,000,000 of people. When they can afford to die in millions from famine and from plague, surely they can afford to die from British bullets too. That is the lesson which Gandhiji wanted to teach us, and that is the lesson which we must learn now. In 1913 I was in this country when Gandhiji was leading his movement in South Africa, Mr. G.K. Chesterton presided over a meeting in the Essex Hall, he called upon me to speak. Other speakers had spoken of Gandhi's new philosophy. I said, "Please understand one thing about that. Whether it is *his* philosophy or Tolstoy's, Jesus Christ's or mine, it is the universal human philosophy". Nobody wins in a battle if there is merely the will to kill. You must have the will to die even before the will to kill. In India we have not the power to kill, but the moment we develop the will to die, numbers will tell. 320,000,000 of people cannot be killed.

There is no mechanization for which you can find money to kill 320,000,000 people. Even if you have got that mechanization, even if you have got the material, you have not the morale (or immorale) to dare to kill 320,000,000 people. We must have in us the will to die for the birth of India as a free and united nation. And this we are fast developing. When this has been fully developed, what can you do ? I do not for a moment imagine that you could find in all England a hundred men so hard-hearted and callous as to fire for long on unarmed and non-violent people ready to die for the freedom of their country. No ; I do not think so badly of English soldiers.

The real problem which is upsetting us all the time has that been the third problem—this Hindu-Muslim problem ; but is no problem at all. The fact is that the Hindu-Muslim difficulty, like the Army difficulty, is of your own creation. But not altogether. It is the old maxim of "divide and rule". But there is a division of labour here. We divide and you rule. The moment we decide not to divide you will not be able to rule as you are doing today. With this determination not to be divided we have come here. Let me assure every British man and woman who thinks of shaping our destinies that the only quarrel between the Hindus and Muslims today is quarrel that the Muslim is afraid of Hindu domination and the Hindu, I suppose, is afraid of Muslim domination. (Dr. Moonje : No, the Hindu is never afraid). Well I am very glad to hear that In my country the she-buffalo attacks only when she is afraid and whatever the reverence of the Hindu for the cow, I am glad he has never the fear of the she-buffalo. I want to get rid of that fear. The very fact that Hindus and Muslims are quarrelling today shows that they will not stand British domination either for one single minute. That is the point to grasp. British domination is doomed over India. Is our friendship doomed also ? My brother took service under the Government and served it for 17 years, but he did one thing for me. He sent me to Oxford. He was always taunting me in the non-co-operation days by saying : "You have a soft corner in your heart for that place called Oxford". I must admit that I had.

I spent four years there, and I always carry with me the most pleasant recollections of that time, and I want to keep that feeling. I do have a very soft corner in my heart for my Alma Mater. But I can taunt my brother, too. When he was being tried at Karachi – when the jury let us off, and there was a British juryman among them, they voted for our release because we were such a sporting lot – my big brother said : "Even if it becomes my duty to kill the first Englishman I come across, if he happens to have blue eyes, my knife will not work ; because I shall think of the eyes of Theodore Beck, my late Principal at my old College, Aligarh". There are several Aligarh Old Boys here, and they can bear witness to the fact that we who were brought up at Aligarh by Beck could never be without a soft corner in our hearts for Englishmen. Therefore, even if British domination is doomed – and it must be killed here – do not let us kill British friendship. We have a soft corner in our hearts for Great Britain. Let us retain it, I beseech you.

One word as to the Muslim position, with which I shall deal al length on some other occasion. Many people in England ask us why this question of Hindu and Muslim comes into politics and what it has to do with these things. I reply, "It is a wrong conception of religion that you have, if you exclude politics from it. It is not dogma ; it is not ritual ! Religion, to my mind, means the interpretation of life". I have a culture, a polity, an out-look on life – a complete synthesis which is Islam Where God commands I am a Muslim first, a Muslim second and a Muslim last, and nothing but a Muslim. If you ask me to enter into your Empire or into your Nation by leaving that synthesis, that polity, that culture, that ethics, I will not do it. My first duty is to my Maker, not to H.M. the King, nor to my companion, Dr. Moonje ; my first duty is to my maker, and that in the case with Dr. Moonje also. He must be a Hindu first, and I must be a Muslim first, so far as that duty is concerned. But where India is concerned, where India's freedom is concerned, I am an Indian first, an Indian second, an Indian last, and nothing but an Indian.

I belong to two circles of equal size, but which are not concentric. One is India, and the other is the Muslim world. When I came to England in 1920 at the head of the Khilafat Delegation, my friends said : "You must have some sort of a crest for your stationery". I decided to have it with two circles on it. In one circle was the word ' India", in the other circle was Islam, with the word "Khilafat". We as Indian Muslims came in both circles. We belong to these two circles, each of more than 300 millions, and we can leave neither. We are not nationalists but supernationalists, and I as a Muslim say that "God made man and the Devil made the nation." Nationalism divides ; our religion binds. No religious wars, no crusades, have seen such holocausts and have been so cruel as your last war, and that was a war of your nationalism, and not my Jehad.

But where our country is concerned, where the question of taxation is concerned, where our crops are concerned, where the weather is concerned, where all association in those thousands of matters of ordinary life are concerned, which are for the welfare of India, how can I say "I am a Muslim and he is a Hindu" ? Make no mistake about the quarrels between Hindu and Muslim ; they are founded only on the fear of domination. If there is one other sin with which I charge Great Britain, in addition to the sin of emasculating India, it is the sin of making wrong histories about India and teaching them to us in our schools, with the result that our school boys have learnt wrong Indian history. The quarrels which are sometimes visible in our streets on certain holidays or quarrels the motives of which have been instilled into the hearts of our so-called intelligentsia – I call it unintelligentsia – by the wrong history taught us in our schools for political purposes. If that feeling, which writes "Revenche" so large over the politics of certain people in India, existed as it does, and if it existed to the extent which it does today, and the Muslims were everywhere in a majority of 25 per cent and the Hindus were everywhere in a majority of 66 per cent. I could see no ray of hope today ; but thanks to the jerrymandering of our saints and our

soldiers, if there are Provinces like that of my friend Dr. Moonje, in which I am only 4 per cent, there are other provinces where I am 93 percent, as in the Province of my friend Nawab Sir Abdul Qaiyum, for which we demand equal freedom. There is the old Province of Sind, where the Muslims first landed, where they are 73 per cent ; in the Punjab they are 58 per cent, and in Bengal 55 per cent. That gives us our safeguard, for we demand hostages as we have willingly given hostages to Hindus in the other Provinces where they form huge majorities.

I want you to realise that for the first time you are introducing a big revolution into India ; for the first time majority rule is to be introduced into India. In the days of Lord Rama there was no majority rule, or he would not have been exiled. The old Pandu and Kuru rulers, who gambled their kingdoms away, did not have majority rule ; Mahmud of Ghazni and Akbar and Aurangzeb did not have majority rule, nor did Shivaji ; when Ranjit Singh ruled in the Punjab, he too did not have majority rule ; when Warren Hastings and Clive ruled India, they did not have majority rule ; and even in the days of Lord Irwin there is no majority rule. For the first time in India, we are going to introduce majority rule, and I, belonging to a minority community, accept that majority rule, although I know very well that if 51 people say that 2 and 2 make 5, and 49 people say that 2 and 2 make 4, the fact that 51 say that 2 and 2 make 5 does not cause them to make 5. Still I am prepared to submit to majority rule. Luckily, however, there are Muslim majorities in certain Provinces, and with the federal form of government which is suited to India, not only for the solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem, but is essential for the sake of the Princes also, this is in our favour. The centrifugal and centripetal tendencies are so well balanced in India that we are bound to have a federal system of government there, not as a distant ideal, as the Government of India says, but today, now this minute. We shall leave this conference only with federation established in India, with new treaties made with the Princes, with the consent of the crown and the Princes.

I sometimes hear it said that nothing can be done without the consent of the Princes. No, Your Highness, we Our Lownesses, will do nothing without your consent. But when, at the end of 1857, the powers of the East India Company were transferred to the crown, nobody ever thought of asking for your consent. There was not so much as "By your leave". Your relationship with the Crown was established merely ipso facto, but it was with a family of Kings and Queens who were really good people, many of whom worshipped their conscience as their King, and it is that which gives us hope.

One more word and I have done. I wish to say that just this about the Army. I am giving away a secret in regard to the Army now. When ten years ago, H.R.R. the Duke of Connaught was sent out to India to open the Indian Legislatures, Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Motilal Nehru and myself were invited by our late lamented dear friend C R. Das, whom our eyes seek in vain today at this Table, and who would have brought Motilal Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi also to this Table had he been alive today, for he was a man of imagination. Gandhiji and I were putting up together as the guests of Das, and I was acting as Lord Chamberlain to Mahatma Gandhi. Any number of people were coming to see Mahatma Gandhi and to touch his feet—I wish he had had the feet of a centipede, but even then he could not have coped with the thousands who came to touch his feet—and in trying to satisfy them and spare Gandhiji, too as much as possible, my life was a misery. Amongst these people I saw 10 or 12 tall turbaned men, not in uniform, but looking and dressed very much alike. I thought they were members of the C.I.D. from the Punjab. My belief, after my arrest and internment in 1915 on the report of a spy neighbour, is that there is no place where God and the British C.I.D. are not present, so that whatever I say and whatever I do, I say and do in the belief that God Almighty and the British spy are equally omnipresent ! I went up to these supposed British spies, and I said : "What can I do for you ? I have been doing a lot for the C.I.D. by way of sedition and I should like

to do something more". They said : "We do not belong to the C.I.D. ; We belong to the Army". "Then what", I asked, "are you doing in this seditious house ?" They said : "We have come to pay our respects to Mahatma Gandhi ; we belong to the escort that has been brought from Poona for the Duke of Connaught". I said if they wanted to see Mahatma Gandhi I would take them in straight away. Mahatma Gandhi asked them whether they were interested in Swaraj, and they said : "Yes". Out of respect for the British Indian Army, I will now stand up and repeat their words. Gandhiji said to them : "Are you interested in Swaraj, you who belong to the Army, and who have been brought as an escort all the way from Poona because they cannot trust the people of Bengal, their first Presidency, for the safety of the Duke of Connaught" ? They said, "Only the other day our Colonel on parade told us laughingly something about you, Gandhiji, saying 'Do you know that bunia, Gandhiji, wants Swaraj for India' and he laughed, and asked us : "Do you also want Swaraj ?" Of course he expected we would all say 'No, Sir', but the regiment very quietly said 'Yes, Sir, we also want Swaraj for India.' Then the Colonel, who was terribly shocked, asked them why they wanted Swaraj, and they told him that when they were sent to fight in Europe, even when they saw Belgian soldiers coming back after a defeat, these soldiers would pull themselves up and proudly reply to anyone who asked who they were are Belgians ; we belong to the Army of Belgium'. Sometimes the French came running back but if anybody asked them who they were, they drew themselves up and replied with pride that they belonged to the Army of France. It was the same with the British ; but these men said that, even when they had won and had saved the French coast at a critical moment in October, 1924, when anybody asked them who they were, they could not say with equal pride that they belonged to the Army of India ; they had to say 'We are British subjects. We belong to the Army of the British Sirkar'. Now these men said that they too wanted to stand upright and be able to say, 'We belong to the Army of India !" I tell you this is the fact, God's own truth, about the Indian Army. You take a plebiscite of the

Indian Army, God Almighty being present, and the British spies, of course, being also present, but some of us also being present, and you will find that we know more than anybody else on that subject India will defend herself today if you honestly want her to do so.

The Government of India Despatch goes further than Sir John Simon's Report and says that the Army should not be under the control of the Government of England but under the Government of India. There are three members of the Government of India the pigment of whose skin is the same as mine, and in some cases even darker. Two of them were my stable companions in England as students, and the third also studied here at that time. If these people can control the Army, why cannot Sir Tej Bhhadur Sapru as Prime Minister of India ? Why cannot Sir Muhammad Shafi or Mr. Jinnah be Prime Minister of India, and control the Indian Army ? Or why cannot even a humble man like myself or my big brother become the Commander-in-Chief of India ? I have no doubt exhausted your patience, but I can assure you my speech has been, so far as I too am concerned, both exhausting and exhaustive I now take my seat and I hope I shall not be called upon to speak again in the Plenary Conference until you announce, Mr. Chairman, that India is as free as England.

KHILAFAT MOVEMENT*

The President gave a historical resume of the Khilafat movement during the past five years and laid bare the position of Indian Musalmans. Regarding their support of the Turks during the war which had been adversely criticised in Angora, he said :

'Circumstanced as we were, it was not possible for us in India to render any military assistance to our Turkish brethren and since the Government was hostile to our aspirations towards religious solidarity, the richer men in the community, who have

*Presidential Address at the All-India Khilafat Conference held at Calcutta on 19 March, 1924

mostly been lacking in courage where Government is concerned, could not assist the Turkish brethren with funds, so that it was only the poor who could assist them even with money. But everything that was possible for a subject nation to do was being done by us, and the contributions of Indian Musalmans in money, although not great enough to provide munitions of war to continue the fight for any considerable length of time, indicated our moral support, and the pressure that we brought upon the Government could not be considered unappreciable. No one can accuse me of overrating the contribution of India to Turkish success, in war or in diplomacy, because I have always said that in the main the battle was fought and won by our Turkish brethren alone. But whether our own contribution was in effect great or small, there can not be the least doubt of our true, heart-felt sympathy with the cause of the Khilafat.'

Treaty of Lausanne

'When the Treaty of Lausanne was signed two things remained for us to do One was the restoration of the Jazirat-ul-Arab through the Musalmans and the Khilafat. And the other was the re-establishment of the Khilafat itself on a firm democratic basis with a representative council of the Musalmans of the world to assist the Khilafat in its great task which had been neglected for generations past but which we could not afford to neglect any longer if we are to save the Khilafat from repeated attacks by non-Muslims and save Islam itself from internal decadence.'

After discussing the question of restoring the holy lands the Maulana referred to the present position of the Khilafat and said :

'It was decided that delegations should go from India to Angora and Constantinople as well as to the Hedjaz and Najd. Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine had arrived at a common understanding with our Muslim brethren abroad with regard to the future of the Khilafat. The most disquieting feature of the situation with regard to this was that indications were not want-

ing that many of the Turks who had been educated in Europe had lost a good deal of Islamic spirituality and were heedlessly rushing into the materialism of Europe.

To-day we are face to face with the fact that the Island of Arabia is still in non-Muslim hands and that we cannot rely upon the rulers set up by England in portions of that island to assist in freeing our holy land from non-Muslim domination and control and that the very champions of the Turkish Khilafat are alleged to have discontinued their four centuries old connections with that Khilafat. It may seem that we are more Arab than the Arabs and more Turkish than the Turks but if our Islamic obligations are understood it will be apparent that all that we are Muslims. As Muslims were who are not Arabs cannot let the Arabs hand over the dominion over the Island of Arabia to non-Muslims and as Muslims, once more we cannot countenance a section of the Turkish nation disconnecting its national Government from the Khilafat."

Proceeding to expound the Khilafat policy as he understood it, Maulana Mohammed Ali said :

"Islam, as preached and practised by the last of the prophets, was t. e culmination of all prophecy. Musalmans are to preach this faith to mankind and to persuade the world to conform to the tenets of Islam, and since practice is essential for faith and mere belief is not sufficient, there must be an organisation which should see that freedom to preach as well as to profess is preserved and there must be at least a part of God's earth where our professions should be practised without any let or hindrance.

The Khilafat is such an organisation with the Khalifa as the personal centre and the Jazirat-ul-Arab as its local centre. Every Musalman is a soldier in God's peace-loving army and the Khilafat is the Commander of the Faithful and the Generalism of that army. That army was about to be crushed and its chief commander was to have been retained as a captive but our Turkish brethren by their sacrifices saved Islam from this

disaster. The citadel of Islam, however, where even a beaten army would take refuse and prepare for recommencing hostilities, is in the enemy's hands and until and unless we restore the Jazirat-ul-Arab to the Khalifa our victory is incomplete and our future is insecure. But the reported action of some of our Turkish brethren with regard to the Khilafat would mean that the largest section of God's army refuses to serve God and to realise his kingdom on earth and this disaster would be far greater for the Musalmans of the world than anything that had hitherto happened. It is true that for generations past the Khilafat has not been functioning prope ly and effectively as we told our Turkish brethren in our cable to them recently. But the revival of the Khilafat is to-day, as it has always been, our ideal and the moment we cease to retain that as our ideal we cease to be Muslims as well.

Europe's Darkest Hour

Materialism is at its height to-day in Europe so much so that even some of the governing classes in Turkey do not seem to have escaped it, but there are not wanting unmistakable signs to indicate that this is Europe's darkest hour before dawn and that the dawn itself will not any longer be delayed. Men like Mr. H.G. Wells have given expression to their own faith which they call modern, and but for a few remnants of their early upbringings as Christians and of their more recent materialism and overweaning confidence in their own knowledge their modern faith is no other than the most ancient faith of Islam, the genesis of which forms repeatedly a chapter of the Koran. It is nothing but the recognition of the sole sovereignty of God, the resignation of the human to the divine will or rather the realisation of the identity of the human with the divine purpose of life which is summed up in the well known creed of Islam : 'There is no God but God.' For a world so situated it will be the greatest disaster if any section of Musalmans discard the ancient faith of Islam and instead of re-organising the institution of Khilafat with a world-wide brotherhood above all national rancour and ill-will and with the ideal

of dethroning War and substituting Peace decides to discontinue that institution itself."

The President next dealt with question of the Khilafat activity so far as it concerned Government and emphasised that the restoration of the Jazirat-ul-Arab was necessary before Indian Musalmans as Khilafatists could make their peace with Government.

MAULANA SAHID HOSSAIN AHMAD

On the conference meeting the next day Maulana Sahid Hossain Ahmad, an ex-president of the Khilafat Conference, gave a religious exposition of the Khilafat, and in the course of a long Urdu speech said :

"The prophet has said that the best kind of jehad is to speak the truth to an oppressive king. In India where to raise a voice in defence of the Khilafat is a heinous crime, still the Muslims have not budged an inch. They have done the best of jehad. In the teeth of all oppression by Government they have helped the Turks with money and moral support."

Shuddhi and Cow-Killing

Referring to the counter-meeting of other Muslims under the inspiration of the Bengal Ministers and Europeans who wanted to create a split amongst the Congress-Khilafat Party, he said : "The traitors are trying to destroy the Khilafat and eradicate its very spirit from the world. A meeting of Muslims, apparently called by the ministers, was held day before yesterday on the Maidan, to consider Shuddhi, Sanghatan, cow-killing and the other problems. The real motive underlying was to create discord between Hindus and Muslims. But, I ask, why no action has been taken against the Christian missionaries who are daily converting thousands to Christianity ?

When in Mecca, I enquired of Shariff Hossein if he ever aspired to be independent and to revolt against the authority of the Turks. Shariff Hossein, in the Khair-Kaaba, Swore by God

that he had no such intention. But to-day we find his son trying to secure for his father the high post of Khilafat of the Muslim World. The Khilafat has been divided into two. One is the Khilafat that has been given by the sons of Adam, whether Indian or European, Muslim, or Christian or Hindu. It is asked by some of our brothers how a man can be the Khalifa of God, but I beg to say that if a man can be the son of God, why cannot he be his vice-regent on earth.

Khilafat Khassa

Khilafat Khassa (special) is given to one person, who is enjoined to see to the peace of the world and see that people put under his care carry out the commandments of God. But this Khilafat must be like the Papal authority which is impotent and thrives on the sufferance of the people but has no power to punish even as ordinary thief. To keep up the splendour of Islam, to make provision for the administration of the State, and take up arms in defence of religion and country is the duty of the Khalifa Khassa.

We all know what Shariff Hossein has done and we know that he cannot as a consequence rightfully claim the Khilafat. So long as the Arabs were true, the whole Muslim World sided with them, but now, when they have broken the traditions of the Prophet, they cannot command, and rightfully claim, obedience from the Muslims. Because the Turks have so long been carrying out the onerous duties of the Khalifa very justly, the Khilafat naturally remained with the Turks for six centuries. One and only one person can be a Khalifa at a time, and there is a 'Hadeth' of the Prophet to the effect that if in the lifetime of one Caliph another claims it, and has got himself declared, then the second one should be killed.

A Democratic Institution

The Khalifat is not a personal property. It is an essentially democratic institution. The acid test as to any person's claim to the office of the Caliph is whether the claimant is a fit person

for it, according to democratic principles. If a man is elected by the representatives of the people to be the Caliph, he is to be regarded as such. Similarly if by the concensus of opinion of the elected representatives of the people the Caliph is found wanting, he may be deposed. It is said that the Caliph must be elected by all the Muslims, but this is impossible and impracticable as all Muslims cannot gather at one time and place for recording their opinion Grave responsibilities are attached to the post of the Caliph and perhaps it has not always been possible for the later Caliphs of the House of Ottoman to acquit themselves well.

It is said that the Indian Muslims have so long been fighting for the Khilafat and the Turks, but to-day those very Turks for whom they have been agitating have abolished this institution. We were fighting against the dismemberment of the Khilafat and against the enemies of Islam who were trying their best to bring about the destruction of Turkey. The history of Afghanistan will show you the intention of the English to destroy all Islamic States. So long as Russia was strong and a menace of India, England tried her best to maintain Afghanistan as a strong power, for as a buffer state between Russia and India, she would best serve England's interests. But to-day when the menace to India from Russia is eliminated, we find the British at once pouncing upon Afghanistan and trying to bring it under her subjugation.

Europe has for long been trying to alienate the Indian Muslims from the Turks. In the internal administration of Turkey we should not interfere, and without knowing the real situation we should not be carried away by the news spread through the agency of enemy propagandist."

Referring to the sudden exhibition of solicitous concern of Anglo-Indian journals for the deposed Khalifa the Maulana said : "The very papers who not long ago were abusing the Khilafat propaganda here are now coming out with long pitiable tales of the danger to Islam from the abolition of the Khilafat by the Turks. You should understand the real motive

of this propaganda. People like Mr. Ghuznavi and others, who had never joined the Khilafat before, are now giving advice *gratis* to the people to accept Shariff Hossein as Caliph. To me Shaukat Ali is a thousand times better qualified man for the post of Caliph than Shariff Hossein. The Arabs have neither railway, nor posts, nor telegraphs, nor are they economically self-sufficient. How then can such a person as Shariff Hossein claim the Khilafat for himself? After all this, I must tell you that the Turks are the only people fit to be the guardians of Islam and the dignity of the Caliph."

The speaker then appealed to the Muslims for contributions to keep us the Khilafat to its old glory.

ON MUSLIM LEAGUE AND INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS*

I

We have always held that Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, for whose political methods we hold no brief, was in the main right in advising the Mussulmans in the temper and in the condition in which they were in 1887 to keep aloof from politics, which provided more than enough excitement, and to concentrate their energies and attention on Education, which was attended with no such allurements, but which was far more essential for their development and progress. On the other hand, a new political orientation was quite natural for the other communities of India that had fully availed themselves during the preceding thirty years a period which corresponds exactly with the growth of a new generation of the three Universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras founded in 1857, just when the last vestiges of the Muslim Empire were about to disappear. It was no easy task that Sir Syed Ahmed Khan had accomplished in founding an Anglo-Oriental College of his own community within two decades of the Indian Mutiny in the very regions which had formed the storm-centre in 1857. In obedience, as

*From *The Comrade*, December, 1925.

it were, to a law of nature, once more nearly thirty years after the foundation of this College, there came into being the Muslim League as a political institution of the Mussalmans, and it is not without significance that fairly prominent among the founders of the Muslim League at Dacca at the end of 1906 were some *alumni* of Syed Ahmed Khan's own College.

II

External stimulus was, however, not wanting, for the Morley-Minto Reforms had been foreshadowed for sometime and a Deputation of the Mussulmans had already waited a few months earlier on the Viceroy at Simla to demand that Mussulmans should be represented on all elected bodies not as individuals but as a community, that their representation should be adequate and effective and commensurate with their political importance that it should be secured to them through separate Muslim electorates, so that their representatives should be their own and not those of a generally overwhelming non-Muslim majority, and that they should be given their proper share in the various branches of the administration. It is not without interest to speculate what would have been the political attitude of the Mussalmans after the awakening of their political consciousness twenty years later than that of other communities if the attitude of the non-Muslim majority in the interval had been that which we have learnt to associate with Mahatma Gandhi. But, however interesting this theme may be, we cannot find time to dwell on it to-day. As for those who denounce and deplore the creation and existence of Separate Electorates for the Mussalmans, we would only ask them to remember that they were the *consequence* and not the cause of the separation between Mussalmans and their more numerous, better educated and wealthier Hindu brethren. The nationalism of these was not the nationalism of Mahatma Gandhi. At the very best they believed in Free Competition, the alien doctrine of the Manchester School, and not in the fraternity of the Joint Family System which consorts far better with our national genius.

III

As one who was intimately concerned with the formation of the Muslim League at Dacca, in December, 1906 and who knows the inner history of those eventful days as only a few others know it, the present writer would like the Hindus to know that even then there were two parties among the Mussulmans, and that one of them was far from hostile to the Congress. The Mussalmans in authority at Aligarh still fought shy of politics, and looked askance at the proposal to found a political organisation of the Mussulmans. *Demortuus nil nisi bonum*, and we love the memory of the late Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk too well to desire to make him the subject of any political controversy to-day. But when the President of the last session of the League not only mentions the name of 'the silver-tongued Mohsin-ul-Mulk' among 'the far-sighted leaders of the Muslim community' under whose guidance the establishment of the Muslim League was decided upon, but gives his name precedence over that of 'the strong-willed Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk', we are constrained to state that Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk and the other local Trustees of the Aligarh College had studiously kept aloof from those that were founding the League, and he came in only at the last moment when he and the local Trustees of Aligarh recognised that the League had come into existence in spite of their studied aloofness.

As for the late Nawab of Dacca, he was certainly keen on founding the League. But on the eve of the gathering of the Mussalmans of all India at Dacca in the Christmas week of 1906 his non-Muslim Private Secretary had already committed him in the course of a Circular letter to the view that a Muslim political institution should be established for the purpose of opposing the Congress. This was nothing very surprising if we remember that Lord Curzon had partitioned Bengal only a year previously, and that the Congress session over which the great Dadabhai Naoroji had come from England to preside was taking place at Calcutta and was none too charitable in it criticism of the Mussalmans of Eastern Bengal whom the Government had managed to enlist to fight its battles by point-

ing out to them all that they apparently stood to gain by the Partition. Nevertheless men like 'the strong-willed Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk' were not travelling to Dacca to found a League to oppose the Congress, and those who accompanied him on that journey can easily recall the occasion when he gathered all that were willing to accept his honest straight-forward lead on board the steamer in which he and they were travelling to Dacca, and plainly asked them whether they agreed with the view expressed in the Circular letter sent in the name of Nawab Sir Salimullah and whether they would find a political institution of the Mussalmans with that object. Every one of them repudiated the idea, and we need not cite another witness in support of this if we state, as we do, that Mr.-or, shall we say, Maulana Mazhar-ul-Haque will fully bear us out. On arriving at Dacca, Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk, Maulana Mazhar-ul-Haque, Syed Hasan Imam, Syed Wazeer Hasan, Syed Nabiullah, Syed Zahur Ahmed, the present Honorary Secretary of the League and the Editor of the Review set about drafting the creed of the League and they soon won Nawab Salimullah over to their side. No one can for a moment believe that Maulana Mazhar-ul-Haque could be a party to the formation of Muslim League to oppose the Congress and fight with the Hindus, and he can testify for the other founders of the League that, howsoever much any one of them may have subsequently changed in his political out-look and attitude, not one had any idea at the time of opposing the Congress or fighting with the Hindus. Messrs Mazhar-ul-Haque and Hasan Imam distinctly belonged to the Left wing of the League, and were or soon after became very distinguished Congressmen. But we think we can safely say for all the rest of those that had helped in founding the League that what kept them away from the Congress was no antipathy to it. but the fact that, like many other Mussalmans, they still hesitated to trust the company that their community had been invited to join.

IV

Trust is a plant of slow growth, and how long it would have ordinarily taken to develop it is not easy to say. But

when once Mahatma Gandhi took the lead, all mistrust was gone and the Congress inevitably drew into its fold every one of the Mussalmans who had not been already frightened away from politics by the realization that it was not all beer and skittles in other words, that it was not altogether an affair of frock coats and fezes and carefully prepared speeches two or three times a year, but meant internment and confinement without trial, and might soon mean imprisonment as common felons, and even the gallows.

But even before the coming of the Mahatma the Mussulmans were getting nearer and nearer to their non-Muslim brethren in the Congress. The Morley-Minto Reforms, which for the first time offered a political opportunity to the Mussulmans, brought the Muslims and non-Muslims into contact with each other in the Councils, without bringing them into conflict with each other at the polls, thanks to the much maligned separate electorates. Paradoxical as it may seem, the restricted joint electorates of the pre-Morley-Minto Reform days had kept Hindus and Muslims apart, and it was the separate electorates that brought them together. By whatsoever way they may have come into the Councils, when they reached there they were got loath to work together. Their common disabilities, if not their common interests, attracted them to each other.

Another apparent paradox was that what the late Mr. Montague called their 'extra-territorial partriotism' served to hasten the development of their territorial patriotism also. The aggression of Western nations against Muslim States reacted on Muslim sentiments in India, and even while undoubtedly diverting to some extent their attention from affairs at home, it hastened Muslim disillusionment with regard to their traditional reliance on their foreign rulers.

The annulment of the Partition of Bengal at the end of 1911, six years after the Mussulmans had been lured to fight the battle of the bureaucracy, completed their disillusionment. Their interests at home were found to be of no greater conse-

quence to their rulers than their sentiments with regard to their brethren abroad. Nothing could have more clearly convinced than the Durbar Announcement of the King Emperor that their dependence upon a foreign Government for support agaınts sister communities laid them perpetually open to such betrayals. They now realized that they could place no reliance on such support and it set them thinking whether they could not make a better bargain with their fellow-subjects and fellow-sufferers than they had made with their rulers, and whether at a smaller sacrifice of their interests they could not purchase lasting peace and even secure the friendship of their neighbours and fellow-countrymen.

This led to an alteration of the Muslim League creed. It had at Dacca naturally emphasised in its creed the promotion of communal interests and loyalty to Government, even though it had also included therein the promotion of harmony and concord with sister communities. At Lucknow, a little over five years later, it emphasised in the new creed that "Self-government suitable for India' was its ideal. This was for the Mussulmans, as the *Comrade* stated at the very time, 'the half-way house from which their ultimate destination was clearly visible.'

This destination would have been reached earlier if the section of the Mussulmans which had brought the League into being had not been hampered by that section of them which had at first kept aloof from its founders at Dacca. It had not been able to snatch from the founders' hands the control and guidance of the League ; but it made their progress painfully slow. In 1912, for instance, Sir Mahommed Shafee was elected to preside over the annual session ; this they could not very well prevent, but they asked, and at last received ample assurance that he would support the new creed recommended by the League's Council. A more progressive president next year, when the forces of reaction had just been pitted in England against the founders of the League, was Sir Ibrahim Rahmatullah. The present writer has had his share that year

in inducing Mr. Jinnah also to join the League, and when the next session took place two years later the progressive party had gone so far as to fix its venue, with the powerful assistance of Mr. Jinnah, at Bombay where the Congress also was to meet. It had also succeeded in getting elected as President none other than that ardent Congressman Maulana Mazhar-ul-Haque whose Presidential Address was far more powerful than that of Lord Sinha, the Congress President. It was the irony of fate that nine years later, when more Mussulmans took part in the Congress than in the League, it should be Mr. Jinnah who should have been opposed to the common venue of these two political bodies at Belgaum. This, however, is a digression.

V

From 1915, when the officials did everything they could to prevent the League from holding its session at Bombay, and succeeded in forcing it to conclude it not in its pandal but in the privacy of a hotel. From 1915 onwards the Congress and the League always met for their annual and special sessions at the same centre, and worked in entire co-operation. In the following year Mr. Jinnah himself presided, and the famous Lucknow Pact which the Government had to recognise and to which it had to give effect was concluded between Hindus and Mussulmans and has so far regulated communal representation. If in 1912 it was possible from the half-way house to see the destination of the League, it was easier still in 1916 to see the halting place of yet another stage of the journey. In 1921 if Deshbandhu Das, the Congress President, was lodged in the Alipore gaol when he should have been occupying the Presidential Chair at Ahmedabad. Maulana Hasrat Mohani, the President of the Muslim League, was 'waging war against the King' at Ahmedabad itself, as the Government alleged though not as the jury could be persuaded by it to accept, and at any rate qualifying for a longer sentence of imprisonment than could be awarded to the Congress President. Alas that the League and Congress did not tread the same path much longer. The next stage of the common journey might have been

the gallows, but the one after that would have been our ultimate destination a Free India. Mahatma Gandhi's imprisonment gave the weaklings of the two communities the opportunity they had so long been seeking, and from the confluence of Congress and League that commenced at Bombay in 1915, and continued as far as Ahmedabad in 1921, the two streams parted once more, and did not meet two years later at Belgaum. We have been at pains to give this narrative because we desire non-Muslims to understand that the Muslim League is not a body of which the members have been of one political opinion, but that, on the contrary, two parties have always existed, and that during the last three years ascendency of the party that brought it into being has been shaken and that the League's decisions, to-day are not precisely those of the progressive party in the League, though it is not idle even today.

VI

We have never spared the Swarajists, just as we have never spared the Non-Changers, when strong criticism of policy or purpose was required in public interest. And we cannot forget the fact that Swarajism was a woeful reaction against the programme, if not a rebellion against the policy of Mahatma Gandhi and has greatly weakened the country's cause in spite of the political splash it has made. But we shudder to think what the consequences would have been if the two great leaders of the Swarajists had been in goal like Mahatma Gandhi, instead of fighting against his two lieutenants at Gaya, and the Congress, instead of becoming the battle-ground of these four, had been left to those whose interest in it has cooled down in the same proportion as it has wanted up in the two communal organisations, the Hindu Mahasabha and the Muslim League. It is quite probable that some of the protagonists on the two sides would have co-operated with each other and, after abandoning Non-Co-operation for themselves as well as for every one else, instead of merely suspending it as the national programme would have welcomed and received with open arms the members of the Liberal Federation and the

National Home Rule League and all others who believe in the creed of Words as against the Work. The Congress would then have provided a safe enough platform for their anaemic politics, but their 'nationalism' then would have benefited the nation no more than their communalism is benefiting it to-day. As for the rest, 'the Second-Class Chiefs,' they would have occupied the communal *gaddis* in their petty principalities as before the 'Coming of the Mahatma', and although no head would have been broken, the two communities would have been no nearer each other than they are to-day. The Government succeeded more than it could have ever hoped to do by locking up the Mahatma, and the following couplet sums up the situation created by it only too accurately :

(We have been brought to this condition by the single fact as the wine distributor's absence that the vats are full of wine, but the tavern is empty).

But things did not actually happen like that. The fight of Swarajists and No-changers kept the Congress divided, but it kept it out of the clutches of those for whom politics means either petitions or a pastime. And Fate itself, in the form of a painful and most dangerous illness, forged a key of Yerwada prison for the Mahatma, in search of which India was groping and he came out. He had to solve two problems, the Swarajist and No-Changer problem, and the Hindu-Muslim problem.

At first he tried to purge the Congress Committees of the Swarajists as many other No-Changers coming out of prison had been tempted to try. But slowly he realised that whereas the masses believed in him and were ready to do his bidding, if only someone could deliver his message correctly to them and could remain with them to guide them, the educated classes either suffered from unbelief, or, when believing, were not equally ready to do his bidding. Therefore instead of resorting like Cromwell, to a Pride's Purge in the Congress, he has thrown it open to All Talents—but with two conditions. He would not substitute Words for Work, nor would he narrow

the Congress creed to please those who believe in 'within the Empire', even if *impossible*, just as he would not *narrow* it to please those who believe in 'without the Empire' even if unnecessary. An all-round agreement has not yet taken place, but the Committee appointed by the All-Parties Conference has yet to meet, to discuss and to report, and agreement in the end is still possible. In the meantime the two wings of the Congress, the No-Changers and the Swarajists have come to a complete agreement, and the speeches of Mahatma Gandhi and Deshbandhu Das in the Subjects Committee on the Agreement are good enough guarantee that it will be honourably carried out. If only Swarajists like Messrs. Abhyankar and Aney also could realise that in the Charkha lies our only chance, and the Marathi-speaking section of the Swaraj Party could be induced to spin rather than purchase the yarn, all would yet be well. But in any case those who believe in the efficacy of the Charkha must, as we have said, go in binkers spin for all they are worth, instead of looking round and seeing whether others are spinning or not.

As regards the other problem, here too, Mahatma Gandhi failed at first to gauge the situation. He was too weak yet to move about as before, but instead of taking complete rest that he richly deserved, and badly needed, he in his impatience wanted to do such work as he could do even then, and began to ascertain, during his convalescence at Juhu, who was to blame and how much. The moment this became generally known, the game of 'claim-jumping' commenced, and Hindu-Muslim tension inevitably became more acute. It was not merely a jocular suggestion, but had a quite serious side to it, that he should burn his dak every day until he could go out and see things with his own eyes, instead of ruining them by reading irresponsible and exaggerated communal complaints.

The section of the Hindu community that had not favoured the Mahatma's support of the Khilafat cause had taken advantage of the troubles in Malabar—which still remains to be thoroughly examined, and with regard to which it would be

still less right to rely on the official version than in the case of the Kohat tragedy. They began to preach to the Hindus generally that these were the first fruits of the Hindu-Muslim unity that the Mahatma had preached, and in this way they sought to diminish his influence and to wean the Hindus off from him. When the Hindus thus induced to organise themselves and to develop physical force and courage began the Sangathan movement, Mussulmans were not wanting to persuade their co-religionists that Swaraj would be Hindu Raj and to play upon the fears of minority.

VII

The Muslim League had not done its duty by the Mussulmans in 1919, and partly for that reason and partly also because its membership was limited by out of date constitutional restrictions, it became necessary to organise a mass movement such as that of the Khilafat Committees and Conferences. Since the Congress was now for the first time truly national, and the Mussulmans could have their territorial and secular interests efficiently safeguarded through participating in its activities, and the Khilafat organisation could safeguard their extra-territorial and religious interests, the Muslim League began to get atrophied for want of use. Many a Mussulman began to question its utility even before the Ahmedabad session. In the keenness of the struggle between Swarajists and No-changers in the Congress at Gaya, that section of the Mussulmans which had so far controlled it, in spite of the semi-permanent President and the Honorary Secretary belonging now to the unprogressive section, forget it completely. But the Shuddhi and the Sanghatan movements save their chance to this unprogressive section of the League, and since the Khilafat organisation and the Mussulmans in the Congress, refused to range themselves against the Hindus who favoured those movements, the League was sought to be utilized by it for this purpose. Political myopia came to effect the sight of the Mussulmans as well as that of the Hindus, and as they moved forward and each to-day became yesterday, all thought of

their common sufferings was left behind and gradually receded into obscurity so that even at a very short distance of time the troubles of today began to blot out all recollection of the terrors of yesterday, and, what was worse, obliquity of vision was soon added to myopia, each community noticing only that which it itself suffered, and failing to see the suffering it too had caused to others.

VIII

Luckily, however, the unprogressive section of the Muslim League is also by far its less energetic section, and the session sought to be held at Lucknow in 1923 had to be adjourned because there was not even a quorum of 75 members. At Lahore last summer this adjourned session was held mainly through the enlistment of new members, locally or from the neighbouring districts, who furnished the quorum. From the other provinces barely two dozen members had attended, and these were for the most part just those who were hostile to the new orientation of the League, and had come only to hold a watching brief. Six months later the next annual session has just been held at Bombay, and were it not for the additional attraction of the Muslim Educational Conference, which was held at the same place on days, just preceding the League session, and for the Congressmen and Khilafatmen returning from Belgaum, there wou'd have been no quorum once more at an annual session of the League. What would have happened but for the latter is indicated by the Address of the President, who was the least representative of all the League Presidents, and by the printed 'Draft Resolutions for the Subjects Committee' which were an echo of the Presidential Address. Mr. Jinnah would not permit this foundling to remain for a moment at his own door, and no one else seems prepared to acknowledge its parentage. The most important of these draft resolutions had to be dropped and many of the rest to which we shall have occasion to refer elsewhere had to be altered beyond recognition. We regret we cannot find space in this issue, belated though it be, for a discussion of the Presidential

Address and of the League's resolution generally. One important resolution, however, deserves immediate mention. It provides for the holding of a Conference at Delhi or some such central place at a very early date to which the League has agreed to invite representatives of various sections of the Mussulmans holding different views. They are to put their heads together, and make one final effort to bring about unity of aim and purpose among Mussulmans and to arrange for co-operation among all these sections for objects conducive to communal well-being. A committee has also been appointed on the same lines to formulate and report to the League the views of Mussulmans as regards the future Constitution of India and the Muslim share in representation on elected bodies and in the administration of the country. Let us hope that a sensible and reasonable report will be presented to the League, and that no matter in whose hands the League remains in future, its policy and programme would be more representative of the views of the community than the Presidential Address and the Draft Resolutions and move in keeping with the national needs of India.

So long as the Congress would not permit the minorities and the backward classes to be crushed by the weight of numbers of the majority or the superior 'wisdom' or greater wealth of the better educated and the richer classes, it must be to it that Mussulmans and Hindus alike would and must look for the delivery of goods'—as Mr. Jinnah love to phrase it—and the only 'goods' that we must all desire to be 'delivered' must be Swaraj and Swadharma. Let us work to that end, rather than go on continually arguing whether it is the organisation of the Muslim League that necessitates the organisation of the Hindu Mahasabha or the organisation of the Mahasabha that necessitates the organisation of the League. Only those need argue this out who have discovered which came first into the world, the fowl or the egg. We shall not concern ourselves with what Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya or Lala Lajpatrai, or Satyamurtis and Prakashams do in the Mahasabha. Our concern is to help Mr. Jinnah to formulate a correct programme

for the League and to bring him into line with Mahatma Gandhi, who alone deserves to lead all India, Muslim as well as Hindu. The Congress is, and must remain the only National Political Organisation, and the Mahatma alone can be expected to guide it and through it the nation to victory. We trust him as we trust neither Mr. Jinnah nor Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and his co-adjutor, Lala Lajpatrai, and the sooner that all these can come into line with him the better for them and for the nation. If the Congress betrays the cause of the minorities and the backward classes it is sure to be deserted by them and will cease to be national in anything except its name. And if the Hindus think that under the Mahatma's lead it will betray their cause, let them desert it and have it closed. But if it is fair to all sections and classes of the Nation, but some of these sections and classes are out, not for justice, but for loot, then the sooner these sectional and class organisations are closed the better. Let the Muslim League and the Hindu Mahasabha both perish, and let the Congress and the Nation survive. We are not against communal organisations for communal purposes, but we are against the spirit of communal grab and communal dominance and if this spirit persists it will turn the Congress too into a pandemonium and the mere closing of the League or of the Mahasabha will not mend matters. Unity can be achieved not by unformity alone, and it can be achieved in spite of variety. But the spite must be the spirit of justice, not of greed, of love, not to loot.

IMPORTANT LETTERS

I

LETTER TO G.K. GOKHALE

Sidhpur
N. Gujrat
8 February 1908

Dear Mr. Gokhale,

By the time this reaches you, a year would have passed almost to a day since our last meeting at Aligarh. The period

that has elapsed has been one of storm and stress even for so "loyal" a man as myself. The "loyalists" among whom I do not number many friends have done all in their powers to throw the blame of the Aligarh strike on me. But you know the facts better than most of them. I have been honoured by being put down on the "Black list" on the Government of Sir John Hewett who has begged the Nawab of Rampur-my chief-to keep me quiet as "he has given us a lot of trouble." I slept like an ordinary man one night and rose the next morning a full blown "agitator" or "patriot". Only recently when death removed the loveable personality of Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk from the Moslem world and made the work of the reformer easier by sparing him the unpleasant duty of removing a weak man from a most important position at a critical moment, men were put up to oppose our nominee, the upright and strong Viqar-ul-Mulk. But when the voice of the community was clearly heard to be on his side Sir John put the best face on the matter and welcomed the new-comer but wanted to take the all-important pledge that "Mohamed Ali would not be your Assistant Secretary." Viqar-ul-Mulk, be it said to his credit, refused to give a written pledge and evaded the question in conversation also. For the sake of Viqar-ul-Mulk, however, I am "lying low" as he has to make his position unassailable. We have great hopes from him and I am sure if you wished to know him you would find in him an honest, upright and bold man who is at the same time level headed and far-sighted. I intend to ask Sir John Hewett for an interview and let him have a bit of my mind in my most "respectful and humble" manner. His latest piece of work is the re-transfer of my brother to Benares, who was only a few weeks ago transferred—not to his own request—to Aligarh and Etah. As he is under the Bengal Government, the first transfer to Aligarh was not known to Sir John till it was a *fait accompli.*

All this must be strange to you, but the poor Mosalmans give me up for lost and think that we two brothers will shortly fill the vacancies that have occurred at Mandalay. Your friend

Mr. Lajpatrai ought to give me a few hints as to the proper department for the deportees.

I have not improved matters by writing the articles, which I have put under one cover now, on the subject of the discontent. But as I have told my Aligarh friends, if I carry a loaded revolver in one pocket, I carry a license in the other. The Revolver is a letter from Mr. Keir Hardie in which he has actually burst into poetry in complimenting me. The other—The License—is a letter from H.E. the Viceroy, not only expressing sympathy—that much used and still more abused word—but "hearty agreement with much that put forward" and wishing "the book of wide circulation it desires." I sent you a copy of the booklet with a couple of articles on Aligarh - the seine of Satan. Trust you will accept the booklet as a humble offering from an admirer of yours. I enclose another copy for my friend Mr. Deodhar, who may be with you. I should like to hear occasionally from him—I dare not say "you also" as I know how busy you are and do not wish to deprive India of moment just to benefit only one of her sons Don't you think that an effort should be made to understand the Mohamedan point of view, now that the extremists are no more with you to frighten the timid among us ? I was touched at the sight of Hindus, Musalmans and Parsee all one heart and one mind in the Bombay Town Hall when the meeting about Transvaal was held last week. I should have to utter just a couple of words if only to associate the "loyalists" of Northern India with the righteous agitation. But I was too late in writing to Sir Phirozshah Mehta and though some impromptu speakers urged their claims and were allowed to appear in print the next morning in the papers, I did not feel inclined to take advantage of the opening. But the meeting suggested to me the possibility of a working unity—not the sentimental rubbish that is too often talked on the subject—between the various "interests" (not properly called races or religions or sects) of India. It cannot be brought about cheap sneers like the one of Sir Phirozshah when putting forward the claims of the Aga Khan to be the Chairman and saying an unmistakable tone that

the Aga was "not a Hindu." I rather liked the dignified but passionate retort of the Aga that he would rather have stood over there on the Hall and shouted lustily and cheered loudly each speaker on the subject of our just grievances than simply sit there in the Presidential chair. Now a Hindu may be unjustly regarded as a synonym for as edition-monger today, but such suspicions are not unique. "The Mosalmans (of India) are, and have been for many years, a source of chronic danger to the British power in India Mohamedan masses drink in eagerly poisoned teachings of the Apostles of Incurrection." These were the words of Sir William Hunter, the official historian of India who was regarded all over the country as a friend, or at least by no means an enemy of Islam and the Mosalmans. Such were the calumnies we had to face and I fear our Hindu compatriots did not always spare us, nor scrupled to take advantage of the position in which we were placed. So the whirlining of time has brought the change harmful to them. Can they not learn thereby to be more just in dealing with rival interests. To expect the Mosalmans—already half starving for want of Government recognition—to resist the temptation and refuse to swallow the bait covering the hook is to ask too much from human nature when the Mosalmans see that the same bait has all along been easily swallowed by those who moralise over the sad end of the guilty fish that is greedy and gullible.

I am sorry that my Hindu friends have opposed hitherto the desire of the Mosalmans to secure independent representation. To talk of unity in the connection is absurd. Each community if it feels that it is an "interest" by itself and cannot trust another to choose its representative must be allowed to choose its own and if that community is based on a racial, religious, or caste difference, its desire should be considered quite as legitimate as if the difference was occupational. Unity will not come if the Mosalmans are refused the permission to select their own advocates in litigation—as unfortunately much of our politics is at present. Men in your position should, I believe, express their opinions clearly and forcibly on such a point.

Territorialism or Provincialism is non-existence in India. At any rate the present divisions of the country into Provinces does not correspond with the sentiment that is territorial, such as Behar sentiment or Rohilkand sentiment. Further, the idea of territorialism is much more practical and rational ; we have to recognise "denominational interests", for practical politics is concerned with things as they are in statesmanship while its idealism thinks of only what ought to be and forgets what cannot successful.

A working unity between denominations is possible and I appeal to you to teach your followers to discard meaningless shibboleths and face the situation as it is boldly and wisely. Denominationalism has no terrors for me. Religious differences have not caused half the bloodshed that territorial nationality is causing every day. The campaign of Napoleon and now the Russo-Japanese war and the small but not in the aggregate insignificant wars of Europe or Russia have not been due to denominationalism but to the same territorial patriotism that is held up as our ideal when I look at the unsentimental but quite practical unity of Canada, I am filled with a hope that we may succeed in doing likewise though the magnitude of our task is a far greater—and our differences are far wider. I know how territorialism appeals to the Hindu mind which has hugged it for centuries to itself. But it is unfair to demand the same intensity and fervour in their territorial patriotism from Mosalmans who are and have been for 13 centuries "a nation without a country." I fear too little thinking has been bestowed on the question and too much talking—and even too much sentiment. Would you not spare some time for this question and bring to bear on it not only your sincerity and true devotion to the cause—which is the part of you I admire most—but also the powerful brain which the world has learnt to admire ? It is not a question that can be settled by any amount of talk or sentiment. We should regard it in its earlier stages as a mere commercial concern which requires not sentiment but business aptitude and level-headedness, not flights of oratory but clear thinking and above all absolute honesty to make it

"pay". Arguing modestly with a mere business almost as petty—if you like—as a pepper and salt concern, we shall in the end have a partnership in all the concerns of our common humanity, a partnership in all joys and in all sorrows. If it is to be a successful business, let us not promise too much in our prospectus. But let us settle how the dividends are to be shared and let us be honest and fair to each other in that. In the three days......of the Congress there is nothing but fraternity and love and all that ; but many of the patriots are as narrow and selfish and as caste-ridden during the remaining 362 days as any Mosalmans whom they denounce as a fanatic. I think men in our position should not be content with a huge mass meeting called the Congress session as a demonstration of a false and factitious unity—not unfortunately reported at Surat—but should have a powerful representative organisation consisting of some hundred or two hundred men all united on the principal questions. I am glad that at last the defection of the Extremists has shown to the Moderates that such an organisation, with a definite system of representation and a definite creed, is necessary. It is with this body that in future the decision of an entente cordiale between Hindus and Musalmans will rest. And it would be more possible for you to guide the smaller body and restrain it and through it to influence the masses. The spirit of this body should be purified and it should be purged of all narrowness. Its creed should be "Justice to all" even before "India for the Indians." Mosalmans—educated Mosalmans I mean—will have no hesitation in joining you if they could believe all your followers, at least most of them, to be like you, not in brain power, not in industry, but in the the sense of justice to all communities. We should be pardoned if we refuse to believe in the honesty of the declaration of unity of men like Mr. Tilak, Mr. Dutt and Mr. Madan Mohan Malviya. Will any Mosalman in Northern India join a concern the Provincial Branch of which is managed by the man who does not preach boycott of British goods but preaches and practises a boycott of the 10 or 20 p.c. of Arabic and Persian words that have enriched the Hindustani language of India ?

Besides, we have no faith in the Bengal or really in the Congress Press. In East Bengal affairs I have verified myself that if a portion of Anglo-Indian Press has taken the side of Mosalmans, the whole of the Bengali Press has shown itself to be a Hindu Press from which no Mosalman can expect justice and truth. I may cite a single instance. My brother-in-law came out from England in March and was full of "Congress Patriotism" after his recent friendly association with many Hindus at Oxford and London. He used to quarrel with me for my "lukewarmness." He went to Behar and is now practising there at the Bar. From what he saw of the Bengalees there and what he came to know of things in East Bengal, he became in June of last year the most confirmed of Anti-Congress or rather anti-Bengal man ! This in 3 months only !

This letter has passed beyond the limits of a letter and I am not going to inflict more of it on you. But I appeal to you to take advantage of the situation and bring about a rapprrochement by learning with patience and application of the truth about the outstanding differences between Hindus and Mosalmans in East Bengal, in Northern India and in Sindh. The fight against Bureaucracy is a good enough occupation and trial of strength. But the fight against our mutual prejudices is more urgent and a still better trial of fortitude and patient labour. I wish Sir Phirozshah would also leave off his "window– dressing" which may deduce Mr. Keir Hardie but cannot serve to hide the truth from ourselves and instead of......which the most thorny and intricate of our problems study the question for a couple of years or more in annual cold weather tours during which he could meet the Mosalmans—not the leaders (for with the exception of Viqar-ul-Mulk we have none) but the young men and the "middle-aged" who have received English education or are at heart as patriotic as any fluent Bengali and yet refuse to join the Congress at present.

Do excuse the long riginula regiuarole. When I began the letter, I meant to cover a sheet of paper and now that I count them, I find I have covered nine !

With all good wishes for yourself and compliments to Mr. Deodhar.

Yours sincerely,
Mohamed Ali

P.S.

Could you introduce me to Sir Phirozshah Mehta as I go to Bombay every fortnight and should like to have a long talk with him.

M.A.

II*

LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY GRAPHIC

In your issue of the 1st November, written on the subject of 'Unrest in India', you refer to the announcement that the Right Hon. Mr. Ameer Ali, His Highness the Aga Khan, and other prominent Indian gentlemen are retiring from the All-India Moslem League,' and suggest that what you call 'the younger party' which according to you has been gaining ground, does not follow the 'advice of the late Sir Syed Ahmed, who realised and taught that true liberty for the followers of the Prophet in India could only be secured through the maintenance of British rule.' You add that 'recently the young Indian Mahommedans felt strong enough to force the situation by sending their leader to England', and that, 'within a few weeks of his arrival Mr. Mohamed Ali has succeeded ; in persuading two of the most distinguished of Indian Moslems to announce their intention to retire from the All-India Moslem League.' You conclude by saying that 'this step can hardly fail to lead to the adoption by the League of the policy closely in sympathy with revolutionary movement among a section of Hindus.'

Speaking for myself, I may say that according to my light I adhere very closely to the advice of the greatest Mussulman of

**From the Comrade*, 22 November, 1913.

the last century to whom you refer and at whose feet I sat for no less than 8 years as a student at Aligarh, and of whose College I am to-day a Trustee. His well thought-out policy is 'sufficiently attractive' for every class of thoughtful Mahommedans whether they be young or old. If, however, there is anything like a 'young Party among the Mussulmans its 'youth' consists in nothing more than being abreast of the times and in touch with all the movements characteristic of Indian growth and development on sound lines, and not in the paucity of years. Its leader is Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk the friend and successor at Aligarh of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. Only he is 73.

As regards the League having any sympathy with 'the revolutionary movement among a section of the Hindus', I should prefer to let the Honorary Secretary of the All-India Moslem League, who is its chief executive officer, speak for it rather than say anything in this behalf myself. Addressing a meeting of the London Indian Association on the 11 October at Caxton Hall, on the subject of the Hindu Moslem unity, Mr. Wazir Hasan, referring to what he called 'chimerical dangers pointed out and needless warnings indulged in by a certain section of the Anglo-Indian Press, which have found an echo in the correspondence columns of an important journal here', said that 'the unity of Hindus and Mussulmans is not to be a unity in opposition to the British Government.... We are not so foolish as to believe that self-government can be achieved in a day. It will only follow the growth and development of a common nationality, and I would be deceiving you if I did not make it clear before I sit down to-night, that I believe the evolution of a nation to be the work of many years and decades of patient labour and sincere and sustained effort. If we are to believe these journals to which I have referred, the Mahommedans seem to be very much like the child in the nursery rhyme : When he is good, he is very, very good, but when he is bad he is *horrid*.' *Is it sane to imagine for a moment that* Indian Mussulmans mean to exterminate the British and oust the British Goverament from India simply because, following

slowly in the wake of the Government of India, they have now come to cherish the ideal of self-government, to which such a clear reference was made in the now memorable despatch of that Government on the 25th August 1911 ?... Is it wise, is it even in the interests of the continuance of the British connection with India, to distort for the ultimate rulers of India (the British Public) the legitimate hopes and aspirations of educated Mussulmans into a movement of anarchical character ?'

As regards the resignations to which you refer, I may say that H.H. the Aga Khan has not resigned, nor has his long-standing desire of occupying a freer position in the counsels of the community than that of President of the All-India Moslem League any connection with the resignation of Mr. Ameer Ali. In a telegram which H.H. the Aga Khan addressed to me from Paris, in reply to my enquiries on reading the 'Times' announcement, the Aga Khan says that while he has numerous reasons for such a decision, which he points out is by no means a new one, but had been expressed on two different occasions within the last three years, and personally discussed with me last March at Bombay, the first and chief reason is that under the present circumstances he considers a permanent President impossible, and in view of the fact that the League has now become more popular, national work should be carried on lines of general popular opinion rather than on the semi-dictatorial lines of the League's early days which are already impossible. He desires us to realise that this essential change is now necessary, and he suggests that the League should have a new chairman every year. Whatever we may think of the desire of His Highness to resign the office which he still holds, we cannot refrain from admiring the frankness and boldness with which he is always anxious to face facts and to state them, and the democratic spirit which gives to him the truest conservatism—the conservatism 'that lops the mouldered branch away.' He thinks more of the general good of his community than of his own position or power, and he, at any rate, can have no sympathy with the semi-dictatorial attitude of Mr. Ameer Ali which is very much out of date at the present time.

As regards your statement that within a few weeks of my arrival I have succeeded in persuading Mr. Ameer Ali to announce his resignation, I fear you flatter my power at the expense of my prudence, and I may say that whatever may have induced Mr. Ameer Ali to resign, I have not had the least hand in assisting him to form this intention. Though you have tried to hang me, so to speak, I must gratefully acknowledge that you have chosen for this operation the highest tree in the United Kingdom. However, my mind was never set so high and I must decline, thankfully, the honour of this bad eminence. I am only one of the 150 Councillors of the All-India Moslem League, and I do not feel qualified to dictate to one in the position and of the eminence of the Right Hon. gentleman. Far be it from me to participate in the amenities of a controversy in which he is one of the belligerents. The only way in which I come in is that Mr. Ameer Ali thought fit to give extraordinary publicity to my alleged hunger for his recognition and his dinner. The facts, however, have been incorrectly stated in the '*Times*'. As a matter of fact, it was the Aga Khan who suggested to us the project of a dinner in order to 'counteract the false charges of the *Times* correspondent', as he himself wrote to Mr. Ameer Ali. He, Mr. Ameer Ali, Mr. Wazir Hasan and I were to be the four hosts. To this Mr. Ameer Ali cordially agreed when it was pointed out to him that he would be saddled with no portion of the cost of the dinner. In the meantime, the Aga Khan modified his original proposal and wished Mr. Ameer Ali only to be a joint host with him, while he wished us to be the principal guests to meet whom others were to be invited. It was to this proposal only that Mr. Ameer Ali demurred, and he requested us to go to Paris to settle the matter with H.H. the Aga Khan in person, suggesting that His Highness alone should be the host. The Aga Khan, however, again pressed him to join as a host, and thereupon the Right Hon. gentleman actually applied for sanction to the Lord Chancellor. Now that he cannot join the Aga Khan as a host, it is just as well to remember that this is because the Lord Chancellor thinks it would be wiser for a member of the

Judicial Committee of the Privy Council not to join a public dinner. Whether a Privy Councillor can still consistently remain the President of an admittedly political body is for him and the Lord Chancellor to judge.

For my own part may I say that my doctors strongly advise me to undertake a 'fasting cure', and I think I can without much danger introduce a variation in this prescription on my own account and dispense with Mr. Ameer Ali's recognition as well as the repast, as I did on a previous occasion when the recognition was profferred to me as the price of my transferring to him the unconsidered trifle on a mere £ 8,000 out of £ 25,000 collected by me for the Turkish Relief Fund of my paper, to his own British Red Crescent Society. On that accasion I considered that the halo was not big enough for two moons, and now it is Mr. Ameer Ali's turn to object to three moons in the same firmament.

III

LETTER TO B.G. TILAK

Chhindwara, C.P.
November 12, 1916

Dear Mr. Tilak,

This morning's paper brought the welcome news that the Bombay High Court had reversed the order of the District Magistrate of Poona demanding from you security "to be of good behaviours" in consequence of the speeches you had recently delivered while inaugurating the Home Rule League.

As you are probably aware, the Censor of our correspondence is not permitted to pass any correspondence of a political character, so that even if I feel minded to do so I cannot deal with the political aspects of the High Court decision nor with those of the decision which it has upset. I, however, think I am at liberty even as a political detenu to congratulate you on so

single a vindication of yourself and your recent speeches. Nevertheless I refrain ; and I do so because after all our characters can best be vindicated by ourselves and our people when we stand at the bar of our conscience and of public opinion. In fact, there is yet a higher, and not only comparatively more infaliable tribunal but absolutely so, which alone is competent to pronounce a final judgment on men and their work. To the Divine Judge who fill the judgement seat of this august tribunal on His great Judgment Day must we leave the vindication of our character.

Nor do I offer you congratulations on the reversal of what only too many people are apt to regard a humiliating decision. To one who has even in his old age willingly and cheerfully gone through so much pain and suffering as you have in the cause of what you held to be truth and justice without betraying the slightest consideration of consequences when duty dictated action, and who has borne with an equal temper the smiles and the frowns of fortune, the offer of congratulations as an escape from further persecution would in any case be a futility and an impertinence ; and all the more so in this case, when it is the Bombay High Court that deserves to be congratulated on its good sense and the vindication of Law and Justice.

Nevertheless, I trust you will permit (me) to convey to you on my own behalf as well as my brother's our heartiest wishes that God may in His goodness vouchsafe to you in this the twilight of your life as wide and as long continued an opportunity as possible to serve Truth and Justice and the cause of this great but unhappy country of ours.

I must confess I had long been a pray to grave misgivings about the catholocity of your political and social ideals and the extent of the connotation of your patriotism. I confess this all the more readily to-day because long before to-day I learnt to regret these misgivings and have already offered my apologies to you in the spirit if not in the flesh. It may perhaps interest

you to know that what brushed these doubts and misgivings aside like a so many cobwebs was your daring and the determination that you have shown in sustaining your self-respect. This may not sound as prize of your altruism ; but, to my mind, in the long run, it is as safe a test as any. He who would not for the world jeopardise his own self-respect of the humblest of God's creatures to be placed in jeopardy howsoever insistent may be the claims of self-aggrandisement or of the aggrandisment of his own caste, sect, community or nation. He alone is not a slave who abhors slavery in equal degree for the meanest of fellow-being Your courage, resolution and fortitude are an example to us younger men, whatever be our politics ; and these have convinced me that after going through all this you could never contemplate with equanimity, much less desire, that even a particle of the same suffering should be inflicted on a fellow-countryman, no matter of what caste or creed, equally earnest in the defence of his freedom and self-respect.

With our deepest regards a humble fellow-servants, of one God and, devoted fellow-workers for one Motherland,

I remain,
Sincerely and reverentially yours,
Sd./-MOHAMED ALI

Shriman Lokamanya
Balgangadhar Tilak,
Gaekward Wada,
Poona.

P.S. :- My brother, Mr. Shaukat Ali wishes me to send you his best compliments. I don't observe you have ever met him. He has met Mr. Kelkar once with me at the Ahmedabad Station when I was at Baroda. Kindly remember both of us to him.

Sd./-MOHAMED ALI

IV

LETTER TO THE KHALIFA FROM PARIS

B-ismi' llah-ir-Rahman-ir-Raheem

Hotel Regina,
Paris.
28th May, 1920 A.C.

May it please your Majesty,

The Indian Khilafat Delegation had the honour to address to Your Imperial Majesty on the 11th May a telegram in which we had endeavoured to explain in brief the mission with which we had come to Europe on behalf of the 70 million Mussalmans of India and the 250 millions of our compatriots of other creeds, the nature of the claims that we had been charged to advocate in connection with the Khilafat and the Turkish settlement, and the state of feelings in India and the East generally respecting the same. We had also ventured to express the hope that Your Majesty and your noble and brave, but distracted and divided nation, would resolutely do your duty not only by Turkey but by Islam, and that the unity of Turkey would soon become a true reflex of the unity of Islam, which stood solidly by Your Majesty's side as it had never stood since the days of the earliest Khulafa.

To-day we beg leave to address Your Majesty in greater detail on some of the points briefly touched upon in that humble message, and the extreme gravity of the present situation for Islam is our only excuse for the importunity that may perhaps be detected in our repeated submission. For this we confidently trust Your Majesty will extend to us your fatherly forgiveness.

After sending the telegram of the 11th May to Your Majesty, we had occasion to meet a prominent and thoroughly disinterested journalist here to whom we gave a copy of that message, and we think it would interest Your Majesty to know what he said to us even before he had read it.

He told us that if he were the Sultan of Turkey to-day, he would forget that he was the ruler of the Ottoman Empire and the head of the Ottoman nation, and only remember that he was the Successor of our Holy Prophet (on whom be God's peace and benedictions) and the Commander of the Faithful, and as such the Servant of the Holy Places and the mandatory of Allah for the Sanctuaries of Islam. He said he would like to appeal to-day not only to the Turks, much less only to the small body of people that are in Constantinople, but to the entire Moslem World without distinction of race and country and political sovereignty, and that he would appeal not so much to the brain as to the heart of Islam. If he were the Khalifa to-day, he said, he would make all Islam weep and pray to Allah and seek strength and support in the spiritual awakening thus effected, rather than waste his time and energies in futile negotiations with people sunk in gross materialism, to whom neither reason nor sentiment appeals which their immediate interests are concerned. In short, he would stand forth, as no previous Sultan of Turkey had stood forth, as the Champion of the Faith and the Vicegerent of Allah on earth, untrammelled by diplomatic conventions and political artificialities.

This friend of our cause did not know when he gave expression to these ideas that our own humble submission to Your Majesty were directed to the same end. But having received confirmation of them from such an unexpected quarter, we now feel that we should repeat those submissions with as much emphasis as is compatible with our profound esteem and veneration for Your Majesty. Islam and not Turkey alone should be the object of our united defence. If the Turks too lay greater stress upon the obvious danger arising from the dismemberment of the temporal power of Islam, and its reduction to an extent imperlling its spiritual freedom, than they do upon the evils resulting from the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire, which must be the natural concern of every Turk to-day, then, not only will the dismemberment of that Empire be prevented as the first fruit of our combined efforts, but Islam

itself will be secured against the menace of strangulation and death which this infamous treaty, if signed, is expected to spell for it. If, on the contrary, greater emphasis is placed on the necessity of saving Thrace and Smyrna, or the Armenian *Vilayet*, then we fear even that result may not be achieved, while it may involve the surrender of larger claims and to a Mussalman infinitely more important principles. Not unoften in the affairs of mankind small things have proved the enemy of big things, and the reduction of one legitimate claim, in the hope of placing the adversary and inducing him to be more just and reasonable than he is inclined to be, has many a time produced results quite the contrary of those desired and expected.

The Khalifa is the repository of the sacred Traditions of our Prophet, and as Your Majesty is aware, according to the most authentic reports, he commanded the Mussalmans on his death-bed not to permit or tolerate any sort or kind of non-Moslem control over any portion of the Jazeerat-ul-Arab, which includes Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia as well as the region known to European geographers as the peninsula of Arabia. No Mussalman can therefore agree to the exercise of any control by mandatories of the powers in Syria, Palestine or Mesopotamia, and what no Mussalman can submit to consistently with his creed, the Successor of our Prophet can submit to still less. The Arabs themselves have protested against all mandates and protectorates in these regions, so that even the principle of self-determination cannot now be invoked with any success by our political adversaries. In fact, when we discussed this question with some representative Arabs, they readily admitted our well-established contention that, even if they were to determine otherwise, their self-determination in favour of non-Moslem mandates or any other form of control could not be binding on the Mussalmans of the world in clear defiance of the *shart'at* and that obviously the Jazeerat-ul-Arab is not the private property of the Arabs, any more than it is of the Turks, to give away or to retain, but the common heritage

of Islam, and subject to the wardenship of the entire Moslem world as a divine trust.

We may mention here that we had clearly stated in our Addres to the Vicerory in India that even if the Turks could be made to acquiesce in a settlement of this in contravention of the Prophet's death-bed injunction, it would remain as unacceptable as ever to every believing Mussalman.

Turkey cannot, therefore, undertake, consistently with the obligations imposed by Islam, to aecept whatever decisions the Allied Powers may be placed to take with regard to Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia, any more than she can accept them with regard to the Hejaz or any other portion of the peninsula of Arabia. Nor can Your Majesty renounce in their favour all the rights and titles that Turkey ever claimed o er these territories, including those which belong to Your Majesty in virtue of the Khilafat, or undertake to recognise or conform to any and every measure which may be taken, new or hereafter, by the Allies in and concerning these regions. It is obvious that such demands can be accepted only if Your Majesty is prepared to renounce the Khilafat itself, and thus reverse the act of cession, after four long centuries, which enabled Your Majesty's great ancestor, Sultan Salim I, to be recognised by the Moslem world as Khalifat-ur-Rasul and Ameer-ul-Momineen.

We feel it our duty to submit that Indian Mussalmans, who have always accepred the rulers of the Ottoman Empire as Khulafa and Commanders of the Faithful without doubt or dispute, are as strong and unwavering supporters of Your Majesty's title to the Khilafat as of any of your long and distinguished predecessors, and that, while earnestly desirous of strengthening the bond which the Khilafat was designed to create and maintain, they will deplore as one of the greatest misfortunes that could befall Islam if anything was permitted to affect Your Majesty's tit o it.

After the foregoing submissions, we need hardly trouble Your Majesty with any further appeal against the renunciation of Your Majesty's undisputed and indisputable jurisdiction over all Mussalmans irrespective of the consideration whether they are your own subjects or happen to be subject to the sovereignty or protectorate of another State. The renunciation of such jurisdiction is the direct renunciation of the Khilafat itself, and neither argument nor appeal is necessary to recommend the categorical and summary rejection of such an unconscionable demand from the Khalifa after innumerable protestations that the war would involve no religious question, and the Khilafat was a subject on which the Mussalmans alone were competent to take a decision.

We may, however, state that we have ventured to place the question of the Jazeerat-ul-Arab in the fore-front of our humble submission not because we are unmindful of other equally unconscionable demands that have been made in the draft Treaty, but because it seemed to us just possible that the importance of the inviolability of the Khilafat might not always be kept in view in the present distracted condition of the ill-fated Turkish nation. But even if we had been inclined to ignore the legitimate requirements of the Turks as a nation, which we could not have done consistently with the claims of our Islamic Brotherhood, the needs of the Khilafat itself would have compelled us to offer, as we are prepared to do every support to Turkey in her vigorous protests against the rest of provisions of the Draft Treaty. They manifestly seek to deprive you, in spite of the most solemn and repeated pledges of the Allied Powers, of your homelands in Thrace and Asia Minor ; they would place your capital at the mercy of your traditional foes, and even then subject to, and, in fact, Your Majesty also, to Allied control, they would rob you for all practical purposes of every kind of resources, financial as well as military, naval and aerial, and, in short, leave you no vestige of independence even as a sovereign State. It does not, however, seem necessary to go into these provisions at any further length, because they are and must be as unacceptable to every patriotic Turk as they

are and must be to every believing Mussalman. The Khalifa to be a Khalifa must be independent, and must possess temporal power adequate in existing circumstances for the defence of the faith. But if this Treaty, or, in fact, any treaty like this, is signed, it is clear that Your Majesty will have neither independence nor temporal power left, and lacking these essential qualifications for the Khilafat, Your Majesty will soon cease to be recognised as Khalifa. Already some Arabs have been encouraged to question your title, though they themselves lack these essential qualifications, and cannot therefore be recognis- as Khulafa. But the purpose of those who are opposed to the very existence of the Khilafat, which insists on what they consider to be divided allegiance, but which really demands allegiance to God before allegiance to any earthly government, Moslem or non-Moslem, will be served all the better if no Moslem ruler remains qualified for the office of Khalifa, and the Faithful are left without a Commander.

If, however, Your Majesty rejects this Treaty in your capacity as a Khalifa, for the obvious reason that its provisions are calculated to destroy the Khilafat and contravene the commandments of Islam, the Moslem World would *ipso facto* be bound to rally to Your Majesty's support, and assist you to the fullest extent of its power, in your efforts to retain your independence and temporal power adequate for the defence of its faith.

As we have already said in our telegram, everything depends upon the kind of response that Your Majesty makes to the iniquitous and impossible demands made in the name of the Allies, and we hope we may suggest without disrespect, that Your Majesty's decision will be the most momentous ever taken by a Sultan of Turkey since Sultan Selim of glorious memory became a Khalifa four hundred years ago. For on Your Majesty's decision will depend the continuance of the Khilafat in his line, and also the uninterrupted and undisputed succession to the Khilafat which has so long been maintained.

But if Your Majesty's decision is what we all confidently expect it to be, you may rest assured of our loyal and hearty support. We have already indicated in our telegram that we in India cannot be satisfied if our claim is reduced by a hair's breadth. We demand that Your Majesty must retain all the temporal power that was your when hostilities broke out in November, 1914, and that the territorial *status quo ante bellum* must be restored. We also demand that Your Majesty must continue to be the Servant of the Holy Places as heretofore, and, finally that there must be no sort or kind of non-Moslem control in any portion of the Jazeerat-ul-Arab, which includes not only the peninsula of Arabia, but also Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia. If these claims are not fully statisfied, it would be futile to expect peace and contentment in India, or the continuance of our undoubted loyalty which has been the mainstay of British rule throughout its history. In that event, the people of India, without distinction of creed and community, have decided to cease all cooperation with Government.

Mr. Gandhi, who had so valiantly and resolutely resisted the encroachments of the South African Government on the liberties of the Indians in that part of the Empire, and achieved such signal success without the use of any violence, is one of the chief leaders of the movement for the defence of the Khilafat in India, and he and other great Hindu leaders have agreed upon a programme of progressive cessation of co-operation, and the Mussalmans have decided to work this programme to the end.

The first stage is one that is calculated to bring moral pressure upon Government by the renunciation of titles and decorations conferred upon Indians by the Government, and by resignation of all honorary offices and membership of Legislatlve Councils. This has already begun, and some frank statements of the reasons for this step being taken have been sent to the Government. But it is clear that those who hunt

for titles cannot be expected to join with true patriots in large numbers.

In the next stage, the civil employees of Government will resign their posts, and since most of the work is done by Indians themselves, this is bound to affect the policy of Government and at the very least make it inclined to be less hostile to Islam than it is today. In the third stage, the Army and the Police Force will resign, and if even then the hostility of the Government continues, the last stage will be reached, and people will refuse to pay the taxes.

In the event of the failure of this movement of progressive cessation of co-operation, the Mussalmans have reserved to themselves the right to take such further action as the law of Islam permits and Government has been repeatedly informed that the only alternatives open to Mussalman in such circumstances are *Jehad* and *Hijrat.*

But so exasperated are the Mussalmans that some members of the police force have already sent in their resignations, and have openly stated that they could no longer serve the Government to which they had been so loyal in the past without jeopardising their eternal salvation, and it may reasonably be inferred that the Mussalmans in the Army, when they see the sacrifices their brothers in civil life are making, will not place their loyalty to Government above their loyalty to God.

Another factor of great importance in the present situation is that some Mussalmans have already migrated from India, and we enclose for Your Majesty's information the speech of His Majesty the Ameer of Afghanistan in which he fully approves of our efforts for the Khilafat, and offers his support for the defence of the Khilafat, and promises to give asylum to all the *Muhajireen* from India. His Majesty's Foreign Minister, who is at the head of the Afghan Delegation carrying on negotiations with the Indian Government, had already announced this, and now his august master himself confirms

that announcement in the most explicit manner. His Majesty is an undoubted *Mujahid,* whose support of the Khilafat can be fully relied upon, and from his speech it appears that the newly liberated Moslem States of Central Asia will also stand by him in such endeavour. Further, it may be pointed out that the disaffection and intranquillity among the tribes on the North-Western border of India, which have lasted much longer than on any previous occasion, and have absorbed the energies and efforts of an unprecedentedly large force, are due to a very large extent to the hostility of the Government towards the Khilafat. In short, there prevails in India and in neighbouring countries a state of feeling for the Khilafat and its preservation so intense and widespread as has never prevailed for any object for many centuries, and we may safely say that other Moslem lands such as Tunis, Algeria, Morocco and Egypt, and by no means excluding Arabia itself, will support the Khilafat no less in its defence of Islam. In these circumstances, we submit we were justified in assuring Your Majesty that Islam stood by your side as it had never stood since the last of the Khulafa-i-Rashideen passed away.

The unfortunate neglect in the past of the duties imposed and the work demanded by the Khilafat has brought the Moslem world to its present deplorable condition, and if we in the present generation also will not make one last and combined effort to retrieve the situation, our chi dren and our children's children will grow up only to curse us and our inglorious memory, and when we march out of our graves on the Day of Judgement to answer for our acts and our omissions, we shall not be able to face Allah and His Prophet whose great trust we shall have so ignominiously betrayed.

We cannot but deplore and condemn the separatist tendencies discernible in some parts of the Moslem World, which are undoubtedly subversive of the Brotherhood of Islam and in direct contravention of its teaching and its very spirit. But when we complain of this, we are told th it the Turks

have themselves to thank for this state of affairs, that their whole outlook at best is national, and that they care little for the Khilafat or for Islam. Non-Moslem critics of position and authority also have begun to ask what the Khalifa himself has done for the Khilafat during the last century or two. Of course, such complaints and criticisms are neither sincere nor disinterested, and besides exaggerating the errors of the past, and taking a wholly one-sided view of the matter, they disregard and altogether ignore the distractions of the Turks for so many generations, and show little appreciation of courage and sacrifices of a noble and brave nation. Nevertheless, it is difficult to silence these critics, and it would be fatal not to confess even to ourselves such truth as there is in these complaints and criticism.

Certainly the Khilafat was always meant to be something higher and greater than merely national sovereignty. And although it is absurd to suggest, as some of the most influential people in Allied Countries are suggesting, that the Khalifa is like the Pope who could be "Vaticanised", and that apparently the Khalifa's sole function in life is to live in retirement like a monk or an anchorite, mumbling his prayers and repeating his beads, it cannot be denied that in the last few generations at least the Khulafa have not asserted themselves as such, and have generally appeared before the world only as Sultans and Padshahs. They were undoubtedly expected to go on the pilgrimage to the Hejaz in person every two or three years, if not, annually, and to make of the Haj a universal Conference of the Islamic World in which its affairs could be discussed in accordance with the divine injunction "*wa shavirhum fi-l-amr*;" they were expected to interest themselves in the progress of Mussalmans in every country, and to assert themselves constantly in checking the abuses which were undermining the strength of Islam, and in promoting the welfare of the Moslems and the advancement of the Mission of Islam.

But all this is so obvious, and no one is likely to know it so well as Your Majesty yourself, who have inherited the awful consequences of the neglect of your predecessors. Our only object in referring to it is to explain that, because for centuries past the work of the Khilafat was done indifferently, the Mussalmans, who never neglected to remember the Khalifa in their prayers, failed nevertheless to come to his aid in the hour of his need, and made but a poor response to his call. They have, however, realised only too well now, after repeated misfortunes and humiliations, that things cannot be left as they are, and that the bonds of the Khilafat must be strengthened at all costs. Therefore, while, on the one hand, they confidently expect that Your Majesty will rise in this gravest crisis of Islam to the full height of the Khulafa-i-Rashideen, they are, on the other hand, themselves prepared also to obey Your Majesty implicitly and to make every sacrifice in obeying your call.

And it will not be out of place to submit that now as ever unity is the greatest need of Islam. Hotest differences of opinion must always be tolerated. But only Your Majesty can teach the Mussalmans to-day that to make of one's opinions a fetish, and to be relentless in the pursuit of those who hold different opinions, even when a still more relentless enemy of both is in close pursuit of all without any distinction of persons and parties, is the greatest betrayal of Turkey and of Islam. The need of reuniting all Moslems, specially such as may be disposed to be divided by discord or distrust one from another, within the fold of the true Brotherhood of Islam, is in fact, now greater than ever before, and we fervently pray that Your Majesty may exert yourself in that behalf. And in particular, any misunderstandings that still remain and divide Arab from Turk should be carefully removed. In fact, this is the very moment when all sects and sections of Islam can be welded together, and we have no doubt that Your Majesty must have been deeply touched as are ourselves at the demonstration of the sympathy and support of our Shiah brothers, who realise that the dismemberment of the Khilafat in the present circum-

stances means the dismemberment of Islam itself. As for the invaluable support given to us by our Hindu brethren, and in fact by all communities of India without any distinction, words fail us to express our appreciation of it, and the only way in which we can demonstrate our gratitude is to play that we may not disgrace Islam when the time comes to make every sacrifice for the liberation of our Motherland. We have assured our compatriots that we can never think of the subjection of India to any alien power, Moslem or non-Moslem, and that they will find us at their side in winning Indian autonomy.

We now ask forgiveness of Your Imperial Majesty for the length of this appeal, which is the result of the fullness of the heart and of the grave apprehensions to which every Moslem is a prey to-day. But before we close this humble representation, let us once more assure you, Sire, that you have lying at your feel to-day such vast stores of love and esteem, of affection and reverence as the greatest king in the world may well envy, and it is for you to accept them and make use of them, or spurn them and deem them of less value than the tiny doles of bare justice that may grudgingly be given to you by others with all the show of generous charity. If it had been possible for us to reach the Dar-us-Sa'adat and to touch Your Majesty's feet, we would have begged and beseeched and implored you to make your choice not as the Padshah of Ottoman Turks but as Captain of Allah's Army of the Moslems of every colour, and as the Successor of the Chief of all Creation and the last Prophet of God ; and we feel certain that with our tears we would have won from you the only answer that patriotism and faith a like demand. But since that is not to be, we have chosen as our great *Elchi* one who must be even dearer to you than we, your spiritual children, for she is the flesh of your flesh and the bone of your bone. Much is lost of Islam, but its womanhood retains its pristine purity and the readiness to sympathise and suffer with every suffering soul. It is one of these noble women that we have chosen to appeal to Your Majesty in the name of your distant children whom common peril has drawn close to you. She will, we confidently trust, plead their cause as no

mother or wife ever pleaded for a son or a husband whose life had been declared forfeit to the Padshah's stern justice, for she is to plead not for the life of a condemned criminal, but for the life of the Khilafat and no Islam. And we hereby charge her in the name of the Allah she worships and the Prophet she would please not to give up the advocacy of our cause till victory is won. May Allah give her the eloquence and the persuasion that bind a spell over human hearts and work miracles. May it be given to her to plead as she has never pleaded before, and to win a victory as woman never won in the whole history of the human race.

With every good wish for your Majesty, for Turkey and for Islam, and with the expression of our homage and devotion, we subscribe ourselves,

Your Majesty's dutiful and loving,
Children

(Sd.) MOHAMED ALI
(Sd.) SYUD HOSSAIN
(Sd.) SYED SULAIMAN NADWI ; and
(Sd.) ABUL KASIM
(of the Indian Khilafat Delegation)

V

LETTER TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND

With the name of Allah, the Most Merciful and the Most Compassionate,

Hotel Wagram, Rue de Rivoli,
Paris, July 10, 1920

To the Rt. Hon. David Lloyd George, Prime Minister,

Sir,—On March 19 last, in the course of their interview with you, the Indian Khilafat Delegation had the honour to submit for your consideration and that of His Majesty's Government,

the views and sentiments of the Indian people in regard to the future of the Khilafat and the proposed settlement of peace with Turkey. We took occasion, in accordance with our mandate, to lay before you fully the binding religious obligations of Mussalmans with regard to the preservation of the Khilafat and cognate questions which, as we submitted, should be respected in any proposals which His Majesty's Government and their Allies might formulate for conducting a lasting peace with the Government of His Majesty the Sultan, the Khalifa of Islam.

Among other things, we hope we made it very clear that the two fundamental requirements of the Muslim faith in this matter are the preservation of the territorial integrity and political independence of the Empire of the Khalifa and the inviolability of the Jazirat-ul-Arab, the Holy Land of Islam. We indicated that, while our people were not opposed to such political changes, in accordance with the understanding on the basis of which the Armistice with Turkey was concluded, as would guarantee autonomous government to the non-Turkish nationalities within the Ottoman Empire, without prejudice to the status and dignity of Turkey as a Severeign Power, the fabric of the Ottoman Empire itself, the dismemberment of which would involve the destruction of the Khilafat, should be maintained intact.

From the reply that you made to the Delegation, it was clear that you were out of sympathy with the viewpoint of Mussulmans, and of the people of India generally, which the Delegation had put before you, and that you were out of accord with the suggestions and proposals that we had submitted. There were also statements of facts in your reply to which the Delegation demurred, and on which we would have been glad to join issue with you had occasion been offered. But as the conditions of the interview did not permit of this, the Delegation have since called into question, in the public Press and otherwise, such of your statements as did not appear to be well-founded. We have also been in correspondence with

your Private Secretary, with a view to obtain the necessary confirmation of the authenticity of the figures of population, etc., on which you appeared to rely in the observation you made to the Delegation. But so far our efforts have led to no satisfactory results, and the information repeatedly applied for has not been forthcoming.

Since you granted the interview to the Delegation, the text of the proposed Peace Treaty with Turkey has been handed to the Plenipotentiaries of the Turkish Government in Baris. Certain observations on the same have also been handed to the Allies by His Highness Damad Ferid Pasha, the Grand Vizier of Turkey, over his sole signature.

The Delegation have carefully examined both these documents, and feel it their duty to submit the following observations on the same for the consideration of His Majesty's Government and their Allies.

We need hardly emphasise at this stage that the Turkish Peace Settlement, vitally affecting as it does the entire future of the Khilafat and of the Jazirat-ul-Arab, is a question in which the Mussulmans of India are as deeply concerned as the Turks and the Arabs themselves. We may recall here that the Deputation that had waited upon the Viceroy at Delhi on January 19 last, with a view to ask for necessary arrangements being made for the Delegation to proceed to Europe and America, had in unmistakable language stated in the address it presented to His Excellency, that even, if the Ottoman Turks could be made to acquiesce in a settlement such as has since been imposed, "it would remain as unacceptable as ever to every believing Mussulman."

After a careful examination of the provisions of the proposed Treaty of Peace with Turkey, the Delegation have no hesitation in declaring that it is one which in its implied intention and effect must directly violate the Muslim conscience. Moreover, we are convinced that it cannot fail to be equally repugnant to our non-Muslim compatriots in India as a whole, who, as

you are aware, are identified wholeheartedly on this question with their Muslim fellow countrymen for the reason already indicated, as well as on account of its general character, which is inequitable and harsh.

It is with profound regret that the Delegation observe that the considerations which they placed before you in the interview of March 19 last, including a statement of the solemn and indefeasible religious obligations of Mussulmans in regard to the Khilafat and the Jazirat-ul-Arab, have been ignored and flouted in this Treaty. They cannot but deplore that His Majesty's Government should have set such little store by the rights of conscience and requirements of faith of one hundred million loyal Muslim subjects of His Majesty is as evidenced by the Articles, and indeed the whole tenor, of the Treaty which was presented to the Turkish Plenipotentiaries on behalf of Great Britain and her Allies.

Irrespective of what the Turks may or may not do, the Delegation must point out that the Treaty under reference is, and must remain, unacceptable to those whom they have the honour to represent. The Mussulmans of India have no opinion but to declare their unhesitating and unconditional rejection of the present Treaty as it stands, and we beg leave to draw your attention and that of His Majesty's Government specifically to some of those Articles of it which run counter to and directly contravene the obligations and requirements of the Islamic faith.

We would first cite Article 139 of the Treaty, which runs as follows :

> "Turkey renounces formally all rights of suzerainty or jurisdiction of any kind over Muslims who are subject to the sovereignty or protectorate of any other State. No power shall be exercised directly or indirectly by any Turkish authority whatever in any Territory detached from Turkey or of which the existing status is recognised by Turkey under the present Treaty."

It is obvious that Turkey has, and could have, no "rights of suzerainty or jurisdiction" over Mussulmans who are not her subjects; but it is equally obvious that the Sultan of Turkey as Khalifa has, and must continue to have, so long as he holds that office, his very considerable "jurisdiction" over Muslims who are "subject to the sovereignty or protectorate of any other State." The law of Islam clearly prescribes the character and extent of the "jurisdiction" pertaining to the office of Khalifa, and we cannot but protest most emphatically against this indirect, but none the less palpable, attempt on the part of Great Britain and her Allies to force on the Khalifa a surrender of such "jurisdiction," which must involve the abdication of the Khilafat. The proposal, we are constrained to say, constitutes a grave and intolerable encroachment on the fundamental religious canons of Islam. And, we may observe, it is all the more astonishing in view of the fact that His Majesty's Government have repeatedly declared that the question of the Khilafat was one for Mussulmans alone to deal with and decide.

Similarly, Article 121 of the Treaty which lays down that :—

> "Turkey definitely renounces all rights and privileges, which, under the Treaty of Lausanne of Octtober 12, 1912, were left to the Sultan in Libya.',

Infringes rights pertaining to the Sultan as Khalifa which had been specifically safeguarded and reserved under the said Treaty of Lausanne.

In the course of our interview with you on March 19 last, we had also formally intimated, in accordance with our instructions, that any form of non-Muslim control over the Jazirat-ul-Arab, the Holy Land of Islam, which includes Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia, was, according to Islamic Law, absolutely ruled out, and consequently non-Muslim domination of these regions, whether in the shape of "mandates" or otherwise, could never be acceptable to Mussulmans This categorical and inalienable requirement of the Muslim faith, supported as it is by the unbroken practice of over 1,300 years, is also, we find, totally discarded by Articles 94 to 97 of the Peace Treaty, read in conjunction with Articles 22 and 132.

The Prophet's deathbed injunction makes the Mussulmans themselves the mandatories in these sacred regions, and they have a right to expect from Great Britain and her Allies a clear recognition in the Treaty of "the sacred character attributed by Muslims of all countries" and respect for the precepts of the law of the Quran" not only with regard to Mecca and Medina and the pious foundations established there, which is already embodied in Article 99, but with regard to the entire area of the Jazirat-ul-Arab, the sanctity of which is equally widely acknowledged and equally firmly based on similar religious precepts. To require the Successor of the self-same Prophet who gave to the Mussulmans a mandate for these sacred regions, to accept the doctrine of other mandates for them in direct contravention of this, and in advance "to accept any decision that may be taken" in relation to questions concerning these regions, to renounce "in favour of the Principal Allied Powers all rights and titles which he could claim on any ground over or concerning these territories" and "recognise and conform to the measures which may be taken now or in the future by the Principal Allied Powers..... in order to carry the above stipulation into effect," is an intolerable outrage not only on his conscience, but on the conscience of every Mussulman.

Apart from the above religious consideration, which, after all, must be the governing consideration in this matter for all Mussulmans the proposed mandates run counter to the doctrine of self-determination on which you seemed to lay so much emphasis in the course of Delegation's interview with you. We may recall that on that occasion, when the Delegation suggested that Mussulmans could well be left to adjust the Arabs' claim to independence with the scheme of the Ottoman Empire and the Khilafat, you had stated that "the Arabs have claimed independence ; they have proclaimed Feisul King of Syria ; they have claimed that they should be severed from Turkish dominion ; is it suggested that the Arabs should remain under Turkish dominion merely because they are Mahomedans ?" We would take the liberty to remind you that if the Arabs, who are an overwhelmingly large majority in these regions,

have claimed independence, they have clearly claimed it free from the incubus of so-called mandates, and their claim to be severed from Turkish dominion is emphatically not a claim to be subjected to the "advice and assistance" of a mandatory of the Principal Allied Powers. If the principle of self-determination is to be applied at all, it must be applied regardless of the wishes and interests of foreign Powers covetously seeking to exploit regions and peoples exposed to the danger of foreign dominion on account of their unprotected character. The Arab Congresses have unequivocally declared that they want neither protectorates nor mandates, nor any other form of political or economic control ; and the Delegation, while reiterating their view that an amicable adjustment of Arab and Turkish claims by the Muslims themselves in accordance with Islamic Law, is perfectly feasible, must support the Arab demand for complete freedom from the control of mandatories appointed by the Allies.

We must, however, made it clear once more, that our views are based on the eternal and immutable principles of Islam, and are held by us irrespective of the views that may be held at a particular time by the Arabs inhabiting these regions, which are not merely the home of the Arabs, but form the sacred trust and common heritage of all Mussulmans.

With regard to Palestine in particular, the Delegation desire to state that Article 99, embodying the Declaration the British Government of November 2, 1917, is extremely vague, and it is not clear in what relation the so-called national home for the Jewish people, which is proposed to be established in Palestine, would stand to the State proposed to be established there. The Mussulmans of the world are not ashamed of their dealings with their Jewish neighbours, and can challenge a comparison with others in this respect ; and the Delegation in the course of the interview with you endeavoured to make it clear that there was every likelihood of all reasonable claims of Jews in search of a home being accepted by the Muslim Government of Palestine. But if the very small Jewish mincrity in Palestine is

intended to exercise over the Muslims, who constitute four-fifths of the population, a dominance, now or in the future when its members have swelled after immigration, then the Delegation must categorically and emphatically oppose any such designs.

With regard to the Hedjaz, Article 98, which requires Turkey, not only to recognise it as a free and independent State, but to renounce all rights and titles there, and Article 99, which makes no mention of the rights and prerogatives of the Khalifa as Servant of the Holy Places, are, and must ever be equally unacceptable to the Muslim world. As the Delegation, in the course of their interview with you, have already emphasised, the Khalifa is the Servant of the Holy Places and must ever remain its Warden, and any attempt to alter his status or restrict his rights and prerogatives in the *harems* of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem would never be tolerated by the Mussulmans of the world.

Moreover, we would point out that Article 100 requires to be thoroughly elucidated. Is it intended, for instance, that "the complete equality of treatment" which is sought to be "assured in the territory of the Hedjaz to persons...of nationals of any other of the Allied Power" will abrogate the well-known and recognised practice "in accordance with the precepts of the law of the Quran," of excluding non-Muslims from the prohibited areas. If so, any such encroachment must be opposed by all Mussulmans.

In the foregoing paragraphs, we have dealt with such Articles of the Draft Treaty as directly contravene the requirements of Islamic law. But no less unacceptable to us and to those whom we have the honour to represent are numerous Articles that are calculated, singly or in their cumulative effect, to undermine the independence and the temporal power of the Khilafat, conditions which are indispensable to its continued existence as the most essential institution of Islam."

In your interview with the Delegation you had referred to the fierce controversy which had raged for over a generation as to the temporal power of the Roman Catholic Church, and to sincere, earnest and zealous Mussulmans who took a very different view of the temporal power of the Khilafat from the one which the Delegation was charged to explain to you, and you were disinclined to enter into a discussion "where men of the same faith take a different view." We are not aware to what school of "sincere, earnest and zealous Mussulmans" you were referring, for although Islam, like other faiths, has a number of sects, we are not aware of any that does not consider the temporal power to be of the very essence of the Khilafat. The Government of India have already received long and detailed juridical declarations of the Ulama in India, which must, we imagine, preclude any misunderstanding on the subject, and no analogies from other creeds can serve any purpose save that of clouding and befogging the clearest of issues.

In full accordance with this clear statement, the Manifesto that the All-India Khilafat Conference issued last February in its Bombay session, which forms the mandate of the Delegation, declared that "the claim regarding the Khilafat consists in leaving the Turkish Empire as it was at the time of the outbreak of the War, except that, although the allegations of Turkish misrule are not admitted, the non-Turkish nationalities may, if they so desire, be guaranteed autonomous government within the Ottoman Empire, consistently with the dignity of a sovereign State." This is the claim that we must still continue to press, and in the words of this Manifesto, "a reduction of the Muslim claim by a hair's breadth will not only be a violation of the deepest religious feelings of the Muslims, but will also be a flagrant violation of the solemn and relevant declarations and pledges made or given by responsible statesmen representing the Allied and Associated Powers and given at a time when they were desirous of enlisting the support of the Muslim people and soldiery."

In the course of the Delegation's interview with you, you were good enough to say that His Majesty's Government

recognised that "the Muslims of India have a right to be heard in a matter which affects especially Islam," and you went on to say that His Majesty's Government had heard them, and not merely heard them, but "had very largely deferred to their wishes in the matter," and that "the settlement was very largely affected by the opinion of India and especially the Mussulmans of India." Presumably you were referring on that occasion to the proposed retention of Constantinople by the Turks as the capital of the Empire. In this connection we desire to recall that the pledge which you gave on January 5, 1918, and which you recognised in the course of the Constantinople debate in the House of Commons on February 26, 1920, as having been deliberately given, after full consultation with all parties, with their consent, and as a national pledge, carefully prepared, specific and unaqualified, covered not only Constantinople, but also "the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace," which you acknowledged to be "predominantly Turkish in race."

But it is clear that in the Treaty Turkey does not in any real sense retain even Constantinople. With a bodyguard of the Sultan, 700 in number, to defend it against His Majesty's enemies, when it is within range of their guns, its defencelessness is obvious; and from your own statements in the House of Commons, it is equally obvious that it is to be kept defenceless by design. Moreover, the multiplicity of controls provided in various Articles of the Treaty for the Zone of the Straits, which includes the whole of this small Turkish enclave, and over the armed forces of Turkey generally, robs the Sultan of all sovereign rights in his own capital, and makes it nothing more than a prison in which the Head of the Muslim world would be kept as a hostage of the Principal Allied Powers. We have already protested against the occupation of Constantinople by British armed forces in circumstances of the greatest injustice, illegality and cruel violence, and it does not seem necessary for us to remind you that of all the "enemy Powers" Turkey alone has been singled out for this form of unjustifiable coercion that is without parallel. This certainly does not

demonstrate deference to Muslim wishes, but, on the contrary, suggests that discrimination has been exercised against the only Muslim Power that was ranged against the Allies in the war.

But in the case of Thrace and Smyrna, even the semblance of their retention by the Turks has been discarded. In this connection the position today cannot be expressed better than in your own words. In the course of your speech in the House of commons on February 26, 1920, you had declared with reference to your pledge of January 5, 1918, that "the Mohomedan population of India were disturbed and they wanted reassurance. We were making a special effort here to procure output for the War, and we were making a special effort in India to secure recruits. We needed all the men we could get for France, and what happened two or three months afterwards showed how important it was that we should secure all the support we could get in the East to do the fighting in Turkey. What is the effect of that statement ? The effect of that statement in India was that recruiting went up appreciably from that very moment. They were not all Mohamedans, but there were Mahomedans amongst them. It is too often forgotten that we are the greatest Mahomedan Power in the world. One-fourth of the population of the British Empire is Mahomedan. There have been no more loyal adherents to the Throne, there has been no more effective loyal support to the Empire in its hour of trial than came from the Mohomedans of India. We gave a solemn pledge and they accepted it, and they are disturbed at the prospect of our not abiding by it... India voluntarily sent to our aid 1,1600,000 men wen enlisted during the War ; taking those who enlisted during the War and before it, very nearly a million and a half. We could not have conquered Turkey without their help. We had not the necessary troops. There were Mohamedan divisions that fought brilliantly throughout the whole of that Turkish campaign. Without their aid we should not have conquered Turkey at all. Were we to have broken faith with them in the hour of victory ? That is what we were confronted with. We might go to them and say 'The circumstances have changed'...

You might have said so, but I will tell you what they might have said. Whenever the British word was given again in the East, they would have said, 'Yes, you mean to keep faith, but you will always, somehow or other, find an unanswerable reason when the time comes for breaking it.' There is nothing which would damage British power in Asia more than the feeling that you could not trust the British word. That is the danger. Of course, it would be a fatal reputation for us" The danger to which you referred on that occasion not only exists to-day, but exists in a greater measure than before, and we would, therefore, respectfully urge that if the "fatal reputation" you then desired to avoid must still be avoided, His Majesty's Government and their Allies must retrace their steps, and permit the Turks to retain within their dominion, not only Constantinople as a free capital of their Empire, but also "the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace, which are predominantly Turkish in race."

In your interview with the Delegation, while stating that "it was difficult to get the facts about Thrace," you had said that you had the Turkish census and the Greek census before you, that there was very little difference between them, and that, according to both, "the Muslim population in Thrace was in a considerable minority" ; and you went on to say that "if that is true, and the principle of self-determination is to be applied, the whole of Thrace would certainly be taken away from Turkish rule." In this connection, we must, in the first place, point out that there was no suggestion in your speech only three weeks before of any doubt that the population of Thrace and Asia Minor were not still "predominantly Turkish in race" In the next place, we do not know how there could be a Greek census of territory still Turkish, and the only Turkish census from which your Secretary quoted figures was taken not only for Turkish Thrace but, as he himself stated, also for "that part of Bulgarian Thrace ceded to the Allies by the Treaty of Neuilly," and was taken as long as a quarter of a century ago. Since then, as everybody knows, enormous fluctuations in population have more than once occurred, and it is the Turkish

element that has increased on account of immigration from violated Macedonia. It is a true that Mr. Kerr also quoted figures according to "the best estimate which the Foreign Office could make" · but he has refused to supply us with any information on the sources of this estimate, and respecting his statements about Greek evictions and deportations, which could enable us to judge of their accuracy. We submit we are, at any rate, entitled to know on what grounds the figures on which your pledge of January 5, 1918 was based, have since been discarded. If to-day, when the Turks are threatened with War, and there is danger of Great Britain acquiring, in your own words, a fatal reputation of finding unanswerable reasons when the time comes for breaking its faith, the least that Mussulmans are entitled to is a plebisticite to be taken in Thrace. But it should be taken under conditions leaving no possibility of doubt its fairness and the absence of all compulsion, and we urge that the agency for taking such a plebiscite should include representatives of the All-India Khilafat Conference.

If anything, the case of Smyrna is even worse. The same pledge that was given in regard to Constantionople and Thrace was given in regard to "the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor," which are also the ancient "homelands of the Turks." The official census of 1914 shows that in this, the richest province of Turkey's Asiatic Empire, there are only 300,000 Greeks as against 1,125,000 Mussulmans, and that in the Sanjak of Smyrna itself, where the Greek proportion is comparatively larger than elsewhere, that were 377,000 Mussulmans as against 218,000 Greeks. Among these figures the only ones that your Private Secretary has supplied to us are based on some "American estimates," about which we could get no further information from him. It is obvious that if this is all that has to be said in favour of such injustice, the Mussulmans cannot remain unmoved when, in the words of the Turkish Grand Vizier's reply, the Greeks are permitted to seize Asia Minor by the throat. As the Grand Vizier has said, to make Turkey renounce Smyrna would be to deprive her of half the commercial and agricultural value of Western Asia Minor, and

no Free Zone could compensate her in anyway for the damage sought to be done by dispossessing her of her rich homelands in Asia Minor.

You have already declared yourself on another occasion to be opposed to the application of the doctrine of self-determination to "every fragment, every locality in every country throughout the world," and if, as you then said, a principle of that kind must be laid down "within the limitations which common sense, which tradition will permit," then the enclave proposed to be handed over to Greek domination cannot be treated differently from the *vilayet* of Smyrna. But in any case, the arrangements sought to be made in the Treaty are obviously unjust and iniquitous. The Greeks were not even at war with Turkey, and yet they were asked to reap the fruits of victory, which they did in the most cruel and inhuman fashion, and their forcible occupation of Smyrna, under the auspices of the Principal Allied Powers, assumed, in the words of the suppressed report of the Inter-Allied Commission, "the aspect of a conquest and a crusade." And while it is proposed to place Muslim majorities in Armenia under the subjection of Christian minorities, and justification is sought for such an arrangement in the allegations of cruelty against the Turks and Kurds, the Greeks, who indulged in revolting massacres and other excesses in Smyrna before the eyes of the Allies, are to administer that region, with the "Option" given to the population to decide five years later in favour of annexation with Greece, but not in favour of reversion of Turkish administration !

With regard to Armenia, the allegations of Turkish misrule are not admitted, and we greatly regret that you have refused to agree to our proposal of an International Commission, on which the All-India Khilafat Conference should be adequately represented, which could hold the first real, open inquiry into the allegations, and substitute for that which is nothing more than interested propaganda, the considered verdict of the civilised world. This was the suggestion which the Turks themselves and also urged, had we cannot infer from this unwillingness the Allies' desire to ascertain the truth.

Nevertheless, the Delegation would gladly agree that non-Turkish nationalities may, if they so desire, be guaranteed autonomous government within the Ottoman Empire consistently with the dignity of the latter as a sovereign State. The fidelity of the Kurds, in spite of interested efforts made to seduce them from their loyalty to His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, has remained unshaken ; and if the Christians inhabiting Turkish Armenia would not agree to an exchange of Muslim population with Christian between Turkey and the Republic of Erivan, they could be just as effectively protected as a minority as the Indian Mussulmans themselves have been protected in India. After a careful study of the history of the disturbances in Armenia, and the peaceful conditions prevailing there before, Czarist Russian intrigues effectively disturbed them, we have every reason to believe that, if interested interference from the outside ceases, Muslims and Christians there could once more live together in peace. But to lop off any portion of the four *vlayets* of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van, and Bitlis, in which Mussulmans number 2,083,000 or 80 per cent, of the total population as against 2,62,000 or 13 per cent. Christian Armenians, as the Treaty contemplates, would be a most unjust and iniquitous proceeding. It would clearly suggest that "the religious issue" is involved and that underneath the stupendous agitation that has been carried on unchecked, particularly in Great Britain, there is a good deal of "the old feeling of Christendom against Crescent" which, as you rightly said in the House of Commons, in the course of the Constantinople debate, would be fatal to British Government in India. And in view of the fact that in the course of the War the Principal Allied Powers had agreed to hand over Turkish Armenia not to the Christians of Armenia, but to the tyrannical and intolerant Government of the Czar of Russia, it will not be possible to-day to convince unprejudiced opinion that the proposals of the Treaty with respect to Armenia are based on a just regard for the interests of the Armenians themselves.

Apart from the territorial clause of the Treaty, which seek to reduce the Empire of the Khalifa to limits incompatible

alike with the principles of nationality and the obligations of Islamic Law, there are the political clauses, military, naval and air clauses, financial clauses and economic clauses, too numerous to be dealt with here in any detail, which unmistakably seek to take away the strength and the independence which are requisite both for the maintenance of the Khilafat and the continued existence of Turkey as a sovereign State. After reducing the armed forces of the Khilafat to an amazing degree, the Principal Allied Powers have devised checks and controls for the remnants left to it to which no Mussulman could ever agree. The preamble to Part V introducing these clauses, declares that Turkey is required strictly to observe these clauses "in order to render possible the initiation of a general limitation of the armaments of all nations." But, in view of the fact that the armaments of the Principal Allied Powers have assumed such vast proportions, while the existing forces of Turkey, if they remained intact, could by no stretch of imagination be supposed to render impossible the initiation of such a laudable task as the general limitation of armaments, one would have expected that the reduction demanded from Turkey would have been initiated by the Principal Allied Powers in respect of their own armaments. Therefore, since they have not thought fit to do so, it would be futile on their part to expect the Mussulmans of the world to reconcile themselves to a reduction of the armed forces of the Khilafat, which must always bear such a proportion to the armed forces of the rest of the world, that Muslim apprehensions with regard to the defence of their faith may reasonably be allayed. The meagre forces which the Khilafat is to be permitted to retain cannot reasonably be expected to allay these apprehensions, and the Mussulmans cannot therefore consent to the required reduction.

Still less can they consent to the Allied control which is sought in the Treaty to be exercised over the armed forces of the Khilafat. These are impossible conditions which are subversive alike of the Islamic institutions of the Khilafat and of the independence of Turkey as a sovereign State.

Similar devices have been embodied in the Draft Treaty with regard to Turkish finance, and it is manifest that they are calculated, and no doubt intended, to put an end to the Empire of the Khalifa as a sovereign state.

These are measures which the Mussulmans of India could never countenance, and their practical inference could only have the effect of abrogating the bond of loyalty which they have so far willingly and steadfastly maintained. The question being one of faith and of profoundly cherished religious obligations, no compromise, as we have more than once already pointed out, is possible.

Even at this eleventh hour, therefore, we solemnly urge upon His Majesty's Government to modify their policy towards Turkey, and their intentions in regard to mandates in Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia, which are parts of the Jazirat-ul-Arab. Any attempt to enforce the present Treaty cannot but alienate, and, if persisted in, permanently estrange the Mussulmans of India, and with them the rest of their Indian compatriots.

Already a programme of peaceful progressive cessation of co-operation with Government has been arranged, commencing with the renunciation of honours and titles conferred by Government, and ending in the resignation of all employees, including the police and the Army, and the non-payment of taxes ; while the Mussulmans have reserved to themselves, in the event of the failure of non-co-operation, the right of taking such other steps in defence of their religious freedom as Islamic Law may dictate or permit.

Already a very large number of Mussulmans, who could not reconcile their conscience with subjection to a Power which appeared to them to be so hostile to the Khilafat, have migrated into other lands ; and a much larger number is about to migrate. We need not dilate upon the calamitous consequences, immediate and ultimate, as insistence on the acceptance of

this Treaty would involve; and we would, therefore, in the name of our people, earnestly urge upon His Majesty's Government and their Allies the withdrawal of the present Treaty, and its substitution by a more equitable, conciliatory and statesmanlike document. A treaty that would respect the religious obligations of the Muslim world and the national sentiment of India, and assure to the Turkish Empire a progressive and independent sovereign government, would also help to initiate a new understanding, consolidate the old friendship between the Allies and Turkey and pacify and reassure Islam.

It is to the future rather than to the past that our eyes should now be turned, and instead of throwing a challenge to the Muslim world, as this Treaty is calculated to do, the forces of Islam should rather be mustered in the interests of peace and progress.

It seems that, in spite of numerous highly significant indications, the gravity of the issue has not yet been realised. A choice is being forced on the Mussulmans between obedience to the clearest commandments of God and obedience to the dictates of mundane governments, and in such a case Mussulmans can only act on the dictum of their Prophet, that 'no obedience is due to a creature of God which involves disobedience towards the Creator."

We have the honour to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servants

MOHAMED ALI

SYED HOSSAIN

SYED SULAIMAN NADVI

ABUL KASEM

Of the Indian Khilafat Delegation.

VI
LETTER TO RAJA OF MAHMUDABAD

Aligarh
December 17, 1920

My dear Raja Sahib,

I received the other day your printed letter inviting me most cordially to join the ceremony of the inauguration of "The Aligarh Muslim University," and would have replied to it at an earlier date if only I had been sure whereto address my reply to you. You had been expected here on the 9th instant and I intended to write to you on your arrival. But you postponed your visit, and when you actually arrived I happened to be out of Aligarh.

As you state in your letter of invitation, I am aware that the Aligarh Muslim University Act has been brought into operation ; but I am also painfully aware that it is not, as you state : "The long cherished dream of the Mussulmans," that "has at last been realised." I am grateful to you for including me among those who have to quote your words, "in sunshine and shade so loyally stood by the MAO College." But that loyalty itself compels me to deny that the College has now "eventually reached its destination". Nor can I feel, as you seem to do that "it has been our privilege to contribute, however humbly, to the achievement of an undertaking to which the community had set their heart, and to which the expressions "great" and "glorious" could legitimately be applied.

I cannot so easily forget that in 1912 the community had rejected with a unanimity that did credit to its intelligence as well as its courage, the terms on which Government proposed to permit the establishment of a Muslim University. Some difference were no doubt created at a later stage ; but while a people enjoyed full freedom of action and of speech the Foundation Committee which was broad based on the people's will stood firmly by that emphatic and unanimous rejection.

As a natural result of repression resorted to by the Government during the war, of which so many of us were the earliest victims, subsequent meetings of the Foundation Committee began to demonstrate a most lamentable gradual weakening. But few pretend to doubt that if a plebiscite of the community were taken today, when courage has happily once more returned to your people, the verdict of the community will be overwhelmingly against the terms embodied by Government in the Act which has been brought into operation.

I feel certain that this would have been the result of a communal plebiscite in any case so long as that plebiscite was honestly taken and was unattended with repression. But new factors of the greatest moment have become operative more recently, and in view of the open and persistent hostility which the British Government has lately been showing to Islam and its cruel and deliberate injustice to the martyred people of the Punjab of which it is still unrepentent, no self-respecting Indian can any longer co-operate with this Government. Much less can a Mussalman accept in direct defiance of the commandments of God, a grant from such a Government for the education of his community or permit its control in any shape or form over an institution intended to be the nursery of the future missionaries of Islam.

The Mussalmans of India had loyally abided by all the reasonable implications of their subjection to the British Crown, and in doing so had confidently relied upon the British Government continuing to respect the obligations imposed on them by their faith, as a condition precedent of Muslim loyalty. In these circumstances Mussalmans had agreed to tolerate some form of Government control in the Muslim University even though state control of education had always been left to be irksome by the best educationists, and doubly so in a country like India where the Nation and the State stood so far apart from each other. But when the Government has, in addition to breaking the most solemn pledges, given to us before and during the war, so completely disregarded our religious obliga-

tions in the Treaty of Peace forcibly imposed on a Turkish Government of its own creation, and is still warring against the defenders of the Khilafat and Islam to permit it to exercise very considerable control over a University of Mussalmans and to receive from its hand a grant for that University is a sin of which no believing Mussalman should be guilty.

In these wholly altered circumstances when the Government had forfeited all titles to Muslim allegiance, the proper course for the promoter of the University to have adopted was to call a meeting of the Foundation Committee to consider the situation thus created and pronounce the community's final judgement on this grave and momentous issue. The least, however, that decency demanded was to convene a meeting of the Muslim University Association. But practically ever since the creation of that independent body the authorities of the Aligarh College had with unique persistence and ultimate success sought to paralyse it and had recognised its existence on rare occasions only to the extent of unscruplously giving to themselves in its name a mandate to spend the income accruing from the University fund on the ever growing needs of their bankrupt College which had ceased to attract Muslim munificence. It was, therefore, idle to expect from the last Honorary Secretary of the College and the Association whose intolerance of his colleagues has been notorious, that he would refer even so momentous an issue to the Muslim University Association so long condemned to remain dormant merely because it contained certain democratic elements. Even at the urgent request of some of us he had not placed before it our letter of the 12th October, in which we called upon it to refuse the professed aid of Government and reject the Charter which gave it such wide powers of the control over the University though he did not fail to get together an irregular Consultation Meeting of that band of re-actionaries, the Board of Trustees of the Aligarh College, 11 but eight of whom are Life Members, as a result not of election but of co-option, in order to delude the public that the representatives of the community were overwhelmingly opposed to the destructive zeal of a few fanatics. Indeed so far

was he from calling the Muslim University Association of which he was as much Honorary Secretary as of the Board of Trustees of the Aligarh College, to pronounce upon the desirability or otherwise of an aid and controlled University at a time when the acceptance of both aid and control had become sinful, that he has since urged upon some Trustees of the College including Nawab Abdul Majid to whom he addressed a letter that is now in my possession and has already been published, to press Government to take the matter once for all out of the hands of the community and deliver the University Funds to an unrepresentative body by bringing the Muslim University Act into operation, "at as early a date as possible". All this because, forsooth "we talked of taking possession of the University Funds", the Government only too anxious itself to deprive the community of every possibility of exercising exclusively communal control over the communal university, needed to pressing at all and precipitately brought the University Act into operation. And now you propose to inaugurate the University thus brought into being and most cordially invite me to join the ceremony.

Well, my dear Raja Sahib, even if I had so felt inclined I could not attend that ceremony for the simple and obvious reasons that by an illegal order issued to me on the 31st October last by the District Magistrate which, at the request of the Honorary Secretary of the Trustees, he personally enforced with the help of a large body of armed police with fixed bayonets I am forbidden to enter even the grounds of my Old College and your new University, and we have not yet decided to offer civil disobedience to lawful orders and by a self-denying ordinances cannot assist force used in enforcing even illegal orders. This, however, does not mean that I do not appreciate the cordiality of your invitation and I have worked far too long with you not to recognise gratefully the affectionate regard you have throughout personally entertained for me. But in view of the considerations I have set forth in considerable detail above which you will yourself agree must be decisive in my case, the ceremony of the inauguration of such a University cannot but

cause the greatest pain to me. Surely, Raja Sahib, this was not the University of your dreams any more than mine, nor can we call this "the achievement of a great and glorious undertaking" to which you and I had both set our hearts. For had that been so, could we not have had our hearts' desire in 1912 instead of 1920 ?

Through the guidance of God I am still true to my dreams and look forward with His assistance to the achievement of a truly great and glorious undertaking, even though we have nothing more to count upon today than 175 honest Muslim youths, (some of them sent adrift by their parents because they could follow God and not Government). Housed in a number of over-crowded bungalows and tents instead of your palatial hostels and cannot even in the near future hope to lift up to Heaven our earnest devotions five times a day from a more gorgeous House of God than temporary construction of thatch and mud instead of your very ornate mosque. I may perhaps not realise my long cherished dream in the flesh as early as you seem to think you have realised ; and it may even be that in spite of my firm resolve to persist in this ardous enterprise the call of my creed and country may possibly compel me at some later date to postpone the pursuit of the educational ideal that has not only been mine but also use to be yours and the final may not perhaps come in my own lifetime. But I have not the faintest doubt that success is destined to be ours and it is in that belief that even today I invite you as your sincere and affectionate friend to reject the base alloy and accept the purest gold.

But whether you accept what I have to offer or not I feel I must continue to work for the old ideals which the experience of more recent years has only served to develop and perfect. As a trustee of the MAO College on behalf of its Old Boys who did me the honour of electing me unanimously for the third time during my absence in Europe, and of the University Funds on behalf of the vast masses of my co-religionists I will continue to exercise such rights and privileges of a trustee as I

am permitted to do in these days of illegal orders and forcible evictions. But consistently with the views I hold I cannot attend the inauguration ceremony of a University that I cannot honestly regard as in any true sense Muslim, though I thank you heartily for the invitation. Apologising for the length of this letter.

I remain your sincere and affectionate friend,

(Sd.) Mohamed Ali,
Trustee of the MAO College and Member
of the Muslim University Association.

VII

LETTER TO SWAMI SHRADDHANAND*

Respected Swami Maharaj,

I am sorry I could not write to you yesterday regarding the matter referred to by you, as per promise, as I had gone out to pay a visit to H.H. the Nawab Sahib of Rampur and had to remain there from 11 a.m. to 8 p.m. I have just now seen in the '*Tej*' a requisition by four of your Arya friends that I should resign from the Congress. I could not help feeling amused at it, although I confess it grieved me also. I am aware that some persons of this type have been engaged in this sort of activity for some time past, but I was led to think that after the reply that I had given to a question addressed to me at a public meeting in Lucknow, which appealed so much to a Hindu gentleman present, that he shouted out in his enthusiasm that 22 crores of Hindus were ready to stand or fall by me, these gentlemen would not venture to pursue their line of activity any further. I now realise how vain this expectation was. Although the manner in which the controversy is conducted at present is such as to render it absolutely unnecessary on my part to give a single word in reply, still as I have already promised to explain to the matter fully, I beg to make the following statement as described by you :

*From *Youug India, 10.4. 1924.*

The fact is as I had stated verbally to you. Even then, some Mussalman friends have been constantly flinging at me the charge of being a worshipper of Hindus and a Gandhi-worshipper. The real object of these gentlemen was to alienate from me the Mussalman community, the Khilafat Committee and the Congress, by representing that I had become a follower of Mahatma Gandhi in my religious principles. I had, therefore, on several occasions plainly declared that in the matter of religion, I professed the same belief as any other true Mussalman, and as such I claimed to be a follower of the Prophet Mohamed (on him be peace) and not of Gandhiji And further that since I hold Islam to be the highest gift of God, therefore, I was impelled by the love I bear towards Mahatmaji to pray to God that he might illumine his soul with the true light of Islam. I wish, however, to emphatically declare that I hold that to-day neither the representatives of Islam nor of the Hindus, Jewish, Nazarene or Parsi faiths can present another instance of such high character and moral worth as Gandhiji and that is the reason why I hold him in such high reverence and affection. I deeply revere my own mother, and if contentment and gratefulness under all circumstances be the true meaning of Islam, I claim there is no person, howsoever well-versed in religion, who has understood it better than she. Similarly, I regard Maulana Abdul Bari as my guide. His loving kindness holds me in bondage. I deeply admire his sincerity of heart. But, inspite of all this, I make bold to say that I have not yet found any person who in actual character is entitled to a higher place than Mahatma Gandhi.

But between belief and actual character there is a wide difference. As a follower of Islam I am bound to regard the creed of Islam as superior to that professed by the followers of any non-Islamic religion. And in this sense the creed of even a fallen and degraded Mussalman is entitled to a higher place than that of any other non-Muslim irrespective of his high character, even though the person in question be Mahatma Gandhi himself.

At Lucknow, when just before the commencement of my speech, some one placed a printed copy of the question in reference in my hand for reply (copies of which had also been freely distributed among the audience) I had stated that I did not want to answer any such questions, as I did not consider that any one, unless he could prove that he bore a greater affection towards Mahatmaji than I did, was entitled to charge me with having reviled him. It was only when I was told that the point at issue was not that I had reviled Mahatmaji, but that I had reviled the Hindu religion, that I gave the above-stated reply. A report of my speech had appeared in the *HAMDAM* at that time, *i.e.* about one month back. I had said further therein that every Christian believed that a Christian, however degraded or fallen, was entitled to a higher place in regard to the matter of belief as contra-distinguished from actual character than any Mussalman or Jew, irrespective of his high character and the same was the case with Hindus or followers of any other religion. My reply proved so satisfactory that I have already mentioned a Hindu friend shouted out that 22 crores of Hindus were prepared to stand by me and several Hindu members of the audience acclaimed it with cries of Bande Mataram, Allah Akbar, while the persons who had brought the printed copies of the question were completely silenced. The beauty is that one of the friends who have now now come forward with a requisition demanding my resignation had quite recently sent a warm invitation to attend a public meeting at Dehra Dun.

I cannot under these circumstances possibly retire from any of my activities as a result of what these gentlemen might say or think. Besides the matter is well within the jurisdiction of the Congress. I wish, however, to state here, and I hope you will bear me out in my statement, that if I, although I am the meanest and the most insignificant among the followers of Islam, am to be regarded by these gentlemen as an enemy of Hindu-Muslim unity and a reviler of Mahatmaji and the religious principles which he professes, then I am afraid they

will not find a single Mussalman who will completely satisfy them.

I beg to state once more that were I not bound by my promise to you, this letter might not have been written at all as I am most unwilling to add one more to the numberless controversies that are raging in the country at present. As for the friends who have thought fit to raise such an unpleasant controversy at a time when the death of my daughter and the dangerous illness of a brother and mother have rendered me physically unfit to engage in any such controversy, I think it best to leave them to be judged by their own conscience. I again beg to record my thanks to you for your condolence and with these words take my leave. If you write anything to the press in this connection, you may publish this letter as it is.

Yours etc.
(Sd.) MOHAMED ALI

VIII

LETTER TO THE EDITOR, THE "TEJ" DELHI*

Dear Sir,

There was one sentence in Swamiji Maharaj's letter which is liable to give the impression that I do not consider right action as essential for salvation. That is not at all my belief nor that of any other Mussalman. The essential conditions for salvation are faith, purity of action, persuading others to good and to warn them against evil and to submit to all consequences of your actions with patience. I hold that a non-Moslem is perfectly entitled to reward for his good action even as a Mussalman is liable to be punished for his evil deeds. The point at issue was not at all as to the essential conditions for salvation, but only regarding the distinction between Belief and Conduct. That is the reason why I gave to Mahatmaji the highest place among all the Mussalmans that I know of so far as actual character was concerned. But to consider one's creed as superior to that of every non-Muslim is the duty of a

*From *Young India*, 10.4.1924.

Mussalman. By stating this I refuted the charge of Gandhi-worship levelled against me and that was precisely my object and not to hurt the feelings of my Hindu brethren or to revile Mahatma Gandhi. If any one can have reason to complain it is my own co-religionists, none of whom I considered to be worthy of being ranked with Mahatma Gandhi in excellence of character.

(Sd.) MOHAMED ALI

IX

LETTER TO PT. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

Bis-millah-ir-Rahman-ir-Raheem La Ghalib-Illal-llah

PRIVATE

Matheran
15th June, 1924

My dear Jawahar,

Do forgive me for not writing to you all this time. You know how much I needed some holiday after my daughter's death and perhaps you can realise how I have been unable to have it on account of Shaukat's relapse early in April and then the conversations at Juhu and finally this trip of mine to Upper India which took me away on the 20th May from Matheran and brought me back here on the 3rd of June. I have had my holiday "in samples" and I do not like it cut up that way. Your letters Nos. 650/30, 750/25, 752/72 and 786 all while I was away at Delhi, Lahore, Aligarh, Rampur (only Rly. Station-British territory !), Naini Tal and Lucknow and No. 824/53 arrived when I was recovering from the fatigue of this journey. Thank God there was nothing that I could suggest to you about the subject matter of these letters, so that Congress work could not really have suffered (It never suffers through the indolence of Presidents who are wise enough in their generation to select an industrious "working" Secretary !) Your last letter 862/40 regarding Konda Venkatapayyaji's election award in the Maharashtra, although

it did not suggest that I would have anything to do with it myself, did not bode anything good, and as fate comes now Mr. Mandlik's (?) postcard which succeeds in rousing me at last into spasmodic activity. To give ruling in the A.I.C.C. meetings is bad enough, but to have to give them in advance is worse. I have written to you separately about that and have enclosed copies of the letters I have written to Messrs. Paranjpye and Mandlik. I do hope you agree with me that the last clause of Art. XIX does not refer to the block of representatives of any particular Province but to the whole A.I.C.C. My ruling is not likely to please Mr. Mandlik and for the sake of "peace", if nothing else, I would have allowed his lot to come and join us at Ahmedabad. But "peace' I am not going to have and so I decided to let the "law" have its course. A Province that fails to elect its representatives in time or in a proper manner can have no grievance against the world if it remains unrepresented and if we went on inviting its old representatives it will have little incentive to look sharp and elect the new set. Whatever grievance it has, is surely against the Provincial Executive and I have enough worries of my own not to grieve over those of others. All the same, I fear Mr. Mandlik will not spare me !

But the more inevitable worry is that for which the Mahatmaji is responsible. You have been very silent about it and besides Shaukat I have had nobody to share my worry. Now do tell me what you think. I do not know whether my conversations with Bapu at Juhu have had any effect at all in the matter of the Hindu-Muslim tension. Perhaps he would have heard next to nothing about the Muslim side of it if I had not told him what I had *heard* because I do not think many Mussalmans had corresponded with him. Since I could not speak with *personal* knowledge all that my conversations could do was to suggest to him that there is a Muslim side too. In one respect, however, I am positive that I failed to impress him at all and that is the character of his "worshipful brother" Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. He comes out of it the best of us all ! And yet both Shaukat and I were under

the impression that Bapu thought very differently of the noble Pandit. If Bapu believes all that he says about him-and there can be little doubt of it then I must despair of the near future at any rate. I had discussed the matter frankly with your father and he told me that he largely agreed with me that Malaviyaji was *out* to defeat Gandhism and to become the leader of *the Hindu only* since he could not be the leader of *Muslims as well as Hindus*, and that Hindu-Muslim unity was *not his* ideal. My dear Jawahar, God knows that the Mussalmans too have their Malaviyas and there is no love lost between them and me. But thank God they have not the influence over their community through lack of ability and well-earned reputation for seif-sacrifice and communal work that Panditji has over so many people of his community. If Panditji is all that Bapu says he is, then I do not know in what category I can place you and your dear father. Certainly you too and he have struck me as poles asunder. But the Hindu-Muslim tension is not my immediate concern. I realise that it will not be removed quite so soon as I had at first hoped. What worries me most is Bapu's "thunderbolt" about the Swarajists which I knew was coming and yet hoped it may not come. Your father does acknowledge that men like us *have* done something to make things easier for the Swarajists, though his appreciation of our labours is somewhat reluctant and halting for he judges them by their results and not by the nature of those labours themselves, as men in his position are naturally apt to do. But we certainly have failed entirely in averting "the bolt" chiefly because it was in a way "from the blue." It was in the very last hour of the very last of our many visits of Juhu that he told Shaukat and me what he was going to do and I came and told you about it, though at the time I was hoping against hope that this had only just occurred to Bapu and he would yet change his mind. Even then we had suggested to him that the analogy of the British Cabinet was not correct that the A.I.C.C. was much more like the House of Commons than the Cabinet. In fact all the analogies are incorrect since the A.I.C.C. is a *federal* body and though the No-Changers command a majority in the

Congress and in the A.I.C.C. they do not command it in all the Provincial Committees and it seems queer to ask majorities in Provinces to resign in favour of minorities.

Am I not right in being under the impression that you too do not see eye to eye with Bapu in this matter ? Do tell me if *you can.*

But there is a question of "legality" also apart from the merits of Bapu's suggestion. Is there any law that can compel the Swarajists to withdraw ? Can any resolution of the A.I.C.C. make the failure of any member of it to spin or card tantamount to his resignation ? It seems to me that whatever view I may take of the merits of Bapu's suggestion, my first duty as President will be to consider its legal bearing. What do you say ? And what do you think is the law ?

I certainly agree with Bapu that the present "sham" must end. We have too long tolerated only "lip respect" for the Constructive Programme and I do think there are many Congressmen whose respect for it in reality is almost nil, but who show their disrespect only in private and among friends and I do not see how we can induce the country to take up work under the Constructive Programme unless we ourselves take it up almost religiously. (The *almost* is a concession to *your* chagrin at *my religiosity* !). And yet I think there is a flaw somewhere in Bapu's logic. At any rate I seem to see an unholy glee on the faces of some No-Changers who were thirsting for the blood of the Swarajists. And whatever good we did by having Bapu's condemnation of the Swarajists toned down has all disappeared in their ostracism through his latest pronouncement. I do not know if their leanings towards a sort of co-operation with Government have not been assisted by it. Your father has preserved his good temper more than I was inclined to expect ; but perhaps that is more for the public and specially for the Government and I fear that your prediction will come true and they will go still farther off from us and go in a very hostile spirit indeed. As I have said in a

recent (and reluctant) interview, I am more concerned with the work under the Constructive Programme that our No-Changers do and less with the work that the Swarajists fail to do. I know the atmosphere for work of this nature is terribly spoilt by the Swarajists, since the educated classes are too often found watching the Swarajists doing in the Councils and its reaction on England and the Government there and here, and it is these classes after all that can lead the masses. But is it any good that even those of us who know how bad it is to be watching the doings of these Swarajists should be wasting time on worrying about this state of affairs. At least we should work and not rail at them.

These are my worries at the present moment and my position is not improved by my being a Mussalman and a candid one at that. As the President of the Congress I cannot give a silent vote on big issues nor—what I would have othewise preferred – refuse to vote at all, though on minor issues Presidents often do not vote. And being Mussalman I cannot seek refuge, as you have done at Allahabad in *resignation*, for I fear any such action on my part is bound to react powerfully on the "Hindu-Muslim unity". Even when insulted by men of the type of those who have sent in a motion for my resignation and "damned by faint praise" or none at all from many others I cannot indulge in the luxury of insisting on my dignity even as man ! So far I had kept my feelings to myself and it was this reluctance to share the knowledge of them with other that had so long delayed this letter. And now that I have given expression to them in a crude and unthinking sort of way, I am "almost inclined" as Jinnah would say – to tear up this letter and consign it to the W.P.B. But I resist—so here goes !

By the way, how do you go to Ahmedabad ? Why not via Delhi with me on the night of the 24th or the morning of the 25th ?

With love to Indu and kindest and affectionate regards to Mrs. Jawaharlal and your sister.

Yours affectionately,
MOHAMED ALI

P.S. As if I had not enough worries what with the Congress and what with the Khilafat (in connection with which Maulana Abul Kalam Azad has attacked me in the Press *without* saying he refers to me) poor old mother has got ill again.

X

LETTER TO GANDHIJI

Kucha Chelan,
Delhi
12th July, 1924

My dear Mahatmaji,

The apprehended collision between Hindus and Muslims took place yesterday, all efforts of Unity Board notwithstanding. A young Muslim lad of about 15 years was mercilessly beaten by some Hindu water-carrier or carriers (*Kahars*) for having polluted latter's *Kalsas* (brass vessels) by splashing some water over them or by so carelessly rising his mouth as to allow drops of water rinsed out (which) fell on some of the vessels standing (sic) near the well (it was a common well in a Hindu quarter). Probably an altercation with and then pursuit of the delinquent ensued, which resulted in a pitiless hammering, the boy sustaining bad cuts and injuries. This led to a rumour that the said boy had been done to death. The next sequel was almost obvious; some Hindus were beaten; crowds of Hindus and Muslims having gathered in the square before the Kucha where first incident had taken place. Crowds remained standing on either side of the square despite efforts of Congress and Khilafat volunteers and the police. Later in the afternoon some trifling incident provided the signal for a free fight. Mussalmans snatched bamboos from Purdahs of shops and Hindus came out of their *Mohalla* armed with *lathis*. But actual rioters were not more than 30 to 40 on either side. No serious

collision took place yet. Some blows and missiles were exchanged. Mussalmans retreated into Ballimaran and Hindus backed into Katra Nil and bolted the *Phatak* (Gates of their *Mohalla*). They gained the top of a three storied house and began a heavy shower of stones and big bricks. At first opposing party standing in the street received hurts from these missiles, and then there was a counter throw of bricks ; but Hindus occupied a height beyond range of throw from the street. But I saw some Mussalmans throwing bricks or stones from the top of the opposite house also. Some of these hit Hindus opposite. Another riot of a similar nature started in another quarter of the town, and solitary Hindus and Mussalmans began (I fear at almost this time) to be laid hold of and beaten. One Hindu to my knowledge was caught hold of and struck pitilessly by *lathis*. But I must confess that first incident coupled with later brick-throwing struck one as both cowardly and provoking. All of us Congress workers and volunteers who attempted to restrain people received *lathi* and brick blows. All exhortation to non-violence appeard to incense people instead of allaying their wrath. Bulk of spectators and others were sorry and deplored it all. But I can say that a handful continued egging others on the yelling and acting like a mad man. Like other Congressmen I also was at a discount and was caught by a brick on the right chin. Meanwhile the Superintendent of Police and the District Magistrate accompanied by more police force arrived and succeeded in controlling these mad men. It was a mortifying thing for me to be told by the District Magistrate "Keep away, if you do not want to take part in it." But I, like the rest of Congress workers, realised that I was of no use. The Police had to resort to blank fire near the scene of the second affray. But I had retired in the meantime, I shall have preferred to die on the spot, but I realised that it would only make matters worse as the news of my receiving any injury, and the news of other Hindu and Muslim workers being hit was already being made a further *Causes belli*. I saw cowardly Muslims and Hindus first fight or attempt to fight as only cowards can, and I saw

a Hindu Police Officer and Anwar, a Muslim volunteer face the shower of missiles without ducking their heads...We were abused by men of our own communities and hit by men of opposite communities.

Some 50 men of whom 10 are Hindus are reported to be in the Public hospital. But many more must have been injured. Larger number of casualties among Muslims are accounted for by the fact that their assailants occupied heights and found a good target in them down below...

Normal conditions, it was reported, have been resorted. But I am not at all sure that it is a correct estimate. I am hearing all sorts af rumours, while writing this, but I shall write again after careful investigation.

Respectfully yours.
MOHAMED ALI

XI

LETTER TO GANDHIJI

Kucha Chelan
Delhi.
12th July, 1924

My dear Mahatmaji,

I must take the earliest opportunity of sending you a correction of my last account. I went to the hospital this morning and obtained correct figures of casualties from the Civil Surgeon. Altogether 69 injured were admitted into the public hospital last night. 50 of these were discharged this morning and only 19 remained in this hospital. Two Hindus were in a critical condition. One Hindu woman admitted into the hospital, it is said, went out to save her son and received some blows in the affray. But she is not bad. I saw among the injured, broken heads, arms and legs. It is estimated, however, that as many more have been injured but they never came to

the hospital. Knives besides bricks and *lathis* have also been used. Two Hindus and two Muhammadans, are reported to have succumbed to blows. Probably they were caught alone and hammered. According to the Civil Surgeon's information among those admitted into the hospital the number of Hindus was greater. In the second affray they must have got the worse of it. It is all so sad. The worst is not over yet.

We of the Congress are worse than useless just now, the object of everybody's wrath it seems for no reason other than preaching restraint! We have therefore decided to admit our defeat quite frankly and leave the maintenance of peace on the guns and bayonets of the police. The military has not yet been called out. But we have also decided to address ourselves to the task of relieving distress where we can. We are sending an instalment of Rs. 100/- for the wounded now in the public hospitals, and we can do no more than attend the injured where possible. Shops are closed and affected area is picketed. When they get tired of this sort of life and sue for peace we shall offer our humble services in that direction. As things are I apprehend further trouble. We are simply vanquished and are utterly helpless for the present.

However you will be pleased to learn that in the midst of this display of contemptible cowardice one or two incidents relieve the gloom. Some 15 Muslims who went to pray in mosque in Katra Nil, the base of Hindu combatants where the fight commenced were shut in and surrounded by Hindus. But Lala Shankar Lal who happened to be there supported by another Hindu gentleman saved these isolated Muhammadans from being hammered, if not worse, by offering his head to the infuriated Hindus in place of those Muslims. It was agreed then that they should be left alone but they should give it in writing that they had not been molested before they were allowed to walk out. Meanwhile the authorities came on the scene and the negotiation ended. It is also to be noted with satisfaction that in some of the predominantly Muslim quarters

Hindu residents have been assured the fullest protection of person and property.

Respectfully yours,
Mohamed Ali

XII

LETTER TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND

Hyde Park Hotel,
London
1st January, 1931

To,

The Prime Minister,

Sir,

It is with a desire to place my views on record before His Majesty's Government and before the British Parliamentary delegates as well as the Indian delegates (who to some extent already know my views) that I have solicited the favour of your kindly sending me my old friend Sir Geoffrey Corbett of Chhindwara fame to be present when notes could be taken down of what I said on the subject of my views about minorities of which committee I am a member.

In the first place it is a misnomer to call the Hindu-Muslim question a question of minorities There are certainly minorities in India, and we must provide for them in such a way that they should feel that the future Government of India is not going to be a Government only for one or two communities, but the Government of all Indians irrespective of creed and caste. Nevertheless the one hitch in the way of the recognition of India's responsibility with a government of her own is the question not of these minorities but the deep-seated differences that divide the Hindus and the Muslims. The fact is so obvious that I need not go into history, nor even present statistics ; but I wish to emphasise one or two points which will distinguish the case of Hindus and Muslims from the case of the minori-

ties. First of all the Muslims ruled over India from the beginning of the 8th century to about the middle of the 19th, in one way or another, and in one region or another, which no other community can claim in the same manner. The Sikh rule for a generation in the solitary province of the Punjab, the result of an accident—I say this without any derogation of the valour of the Sikhs and of the high respect I feel for their organization as a panth—nor the depredations of Mahrattas and their confederacy, are any parallel to the history of the Muslims in India. Whether by conquest or by diplomacy the Muslim rule had passed finally from the hands of the Muslims to those of the British, barring of course the rule of the Indian States, many of which remain from time immemorial, great and distinguished Hindu principalities tracing their origin even from the sun and the moon. Whatever the relations of the Muslim power as suzerian or as the paramount power to these Hindu States, there is not the least doubt that they retained not only for the most part a deep feeling of loyalty towards the Muslim power, but also a degree of independence which they have more recently lost since the transference of Muslim power into British hands. Other States are, of course, the creation of the times during the break-up of the Mughal Empire which have been recognised by the British. Some, like Hyderabad, were larger powers at the time of the original treaties than the East India Company of which they became faithful allies and others were smaller, but with that I am not at present concerned.

What I desire to sketch is that rightly or wrongly the Muslim community ruled over India in one way or another from the 8th to the middle of the 19th century in some part of the country or another and that no other community has anything like that record.

A very important result of that which we have to deal today is the feeling created by the record of Muslim rule for so long over so large a part of India. There is hardly a community that has not a real or an imaginary grievance against the old Muslim rulers and what we know of human nature elsewhere

brings home to us that even to-day there is a feeling of "revanche" harboured against the Muslims in the minds of some Hindus and some members of other community whether Sikh or Mahratta or Rajput. It is with this feeling that we must deal, and against which we must provide safeguards for the future when framing a constitution for an ideal Indian Government in which all would feel safe, equal and free.

The next consideration is that the Muslims constitute not a minority in the sense in which the last war and its sequel has habituated us to consider European minorities. The League of Nations deals with minorities and our Indian savants and professors easily borrow maxims from the League of Nations and its dealings with minorities and with mandates and want to guide India from Geneva when in reality it is India itself that can provide far better guidance for Geneva. A community that in India alone must now be numbering more than 70 millions cannot easily be called a minority in the sense of Geneva minorities, and when it is remembered that this community numbers nearly 400 millions of people throughout the world, whose ambition is to convert the rest of mankind to their way of thought and their outlook on life, and who claim and feel a unique brotherhood ; to talk of it as a minority is a mere absurdity.

Keeping these two main facts in mind let us now proceed with the problem that we have before us. It was proposed by a member of the Hindu Mahasabha in the Round Table Conference delegation that the Prime Minister should act as an arbitrator between the two communities, which was no doubt very flattering to the Prime Minister, but which would have made his position far too invidious, and he naturally declined the offer with thanks, and I feel certain that he must have seen through the motive that prompted the suggestion. We have heard suggestions of the matter being referred to the League of Nations. That would mean washing the dirty linen of India before the whole world. As it is, we are disgusted with the fact that the Indian Round Table Conference has been made

the Dhobi Talao (the washerman's tank) of Indian communalism. This question should have been settled in India. We who worked for ten years through thick and thin with Gandhiji pressed that upon him, but the desire of retaining Hindu popularity for himself and for Pandit Motilal Nehru (who, I am sorry, is absent) prevented a settlement. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru tried his utmost to have a Hindu-Muslim settlement when the Congress at our urgent request in December 1928 failed to do so and Sir S.P. Patro was most keen. But the Hindu Mahasabha pretended to share this desire with the Liberal Hindus and the Muslims at first and after postponing meeting after meeting absolutely refused to take any part in the Conference at Bombay and Dr. Moonje was quite frank about his refusal to do anything to arrive at a settlement in India before the Round Table Conference. The Congress followed the Hindu Mahasabha in refusing even to come to the Round Table Conference for a settlement when a settlement was inevitable before an Indian constitution could be framed. But three members of the Hindu Mahasabha nevertheless came over, and in spite of every effort of Muslim and the Hindu Liberals have defeated the settlement so far. It is not for me to say how much time they have usurped in all these conciliatory talks both among the Hindus and Muslims themselves and with the Prime Minister. I think the Prime Minister can judge that better for himself. Now that a formal committee has been formed for this purpose it is essential that the case for a settlement should be clearly stated.

In the first place, I would like with the greatest courtesy and friendliness to warn the Prime Minisier that it is not a case of the Punjab or Bengal, as he seems to imagine, nor of reducing the figure of 110 in the Punjab to 100 or anything like it, as he seems to think when he was making his conciliatory effort at the Chequers. The entire question is, as I suggested in my speech in the Plenary Conference that for the first time in the history of India we intend to introduce into India majority rule, and those who have been usurping the control of the destinies of those called Hindus for so many thousands of years

do not want that there should be any majority, Indian or Hindu, except that which they can control precisely as they have controlled the Hindus for thousands of years. Let me add that there is one important difference. Sir John Simon is somewhat out of date when he refers like the late Sir Valentine Chirol to Brahman rule. The Brahman had at least taught the people and had at least the mistaken notion that they brought salvation to people in the next world. The small monopolistic caste that desires to remain in control of the destinies of the Hindu community and that being the majority community of the Indian nation as a whole through it, --is the case not so much of Dr. Moonje and Raja Narendra Nath, but of the *bania* who has no conception of the salvation of anybody in the next world, nor even of the teaching of anyone in this. I am more anxious than any Indian perhaps to get rid of foreign incubus, if I may be forgiven to say so, of "a nation of shopkeepers" controlling our destinies. But as I wrote to His Excellency the Viceroy in reply to the invitation of His Majesty's Government to me to this Conference, I do not wish to create a home-made incubus of a caste of shopkeepers of our own. To my mind the agitation to-day is being financed-and partly for selfish reasons by the banias of Bombay and Gujarat, and although I have always laughingly said I do not care a tuppenny damn for 1/4 or 1/6, the fight to-day is not so much for the freedom of India as for 1/4 against 1/6. This may be entirely justified but it is not the fight for India's freedom in its larger sense.

Now to deal with the Hindu-Muslim problem. It is not a provincial question. In every province Hindu and Muslim sentiment vis-a-vis each other is more or less the same. The Muslims lost the control of India nearly three generations ago and the British gained it mostly from the Muslims, though to some extent from the Mahrattas who were the Mayors of the Palace in Delhi and Partly from the Sikhs in the Punjab whom the British themselves encouraged to rule there against the Muslims because of their own war with Afghanistan. Now India wants to regain that control, and the Muslims, as we showed ten years ago, have not been lacking in self-sacrifice

for this purpose. To-day some Muslims are still taking part in the Congress movement, but they are men who are doing it more out of the habit of freedom than otherwise Many have kept away from the movement of Civil Disobedience as they had kept away from non-co-operation ten years ago, even when Turkey was involved in the question. Without exaggerating our own importance we can say that it is not these people, many of whom have been selected as delegates to the Indian Round Table Conference by His Majesty's Government or by the Government of India, or by Local Governments and officers—whoever does it—that have exercised much influence in keeping the Muslims away from joining the Congress again as they did with us ten years ago. Even though we have to say it, it is we who had to fight the battle practically in every province, and to a very large extent indeed we succeeded in keeping the Muslims out, because we showed to them that the last movement was a truly national movement, while in the present movement I regret to have to say in their absence, Gandhi and Pandit Motilal Nehru have both surrendered for the sake of their popularity to the Hindu Mahasabha. Now that we have come here, I am the only representative of my party—in spite of my long correspondence with his Excellency the Viceroy on the subject while I was lying in India before the final selection was made—to represent it in the Round Table Conference, and more than any one else among the Muslims it will be I—and of course my brother—who on our return will be asked by the millions of Muslims what we have brought back for the Muslims. Well, we want to go back not with separate electorates only, nor with weightage only for the Muslims but with freedom for India including freedom for the Muslims and unless we can secure that, I can assure the Prime Minister that the Muslims of India will join the Civil Disobedience Movement without the least hesitation no matter what we may say and what the other Muslim delegates may say.

Freedom for India is not separate electorates, though being one of the authors of the separate electorates in 1906, I shall be the last to surrender them. Let me first say what is the use of

separate electorates. A separate electorate gives to the Muslim client in the case he is fighting the counsel that he selects himself and can trust. In every law court every client is permitted to do that even though sometimes he is provided with counsel at Government expense. The other party is certainly never allowed to choose his counsel for him. If there had been an independent and impartial judge all that we would have needed would have been a trustworthy counsel, and that was just that was provided a generation ago for us so wisely by Lords Morley and Minto. There was no idea in the mind of Lord Morley to give India anything but a Parliamentary British Government. There was the official block. There was in the Government of India the British official majority and it was admittedly kept there to show that there was no idea of the introduction of Parliamentary Government into India. Each community presented its case as a client before the judge and it was the judge that decided. We could only influence, never guide and advise him. Therefore all that was needed was a trustworthy counsel selected by the client himself which we did through the separate electorates.

Even then somehow by accident, if not by design, Lord Minto had provided not only the needs of the present, but also something for the prospects of the future. The separate electorates had been provided only to *supplement*, though to a very large extent, the deficiency that the Muslims were expected to encounter through the narrowness of the Hindu majority in their representation through the general territorial electorates. Lord Morley had not deprived the Muslims of their share in the mixed electorates themselves. That was a fatal mistake that was made at the urgent suggestion of our Hindu friends in 1916 at Lucknow when we two brothers were interned in Chhindwara and could take no part in the politics of the Lucknow Muslim League and the Congress. For the first time separate electorates became the only resource for Muslim representation.

Another grave mistake, that was then made, for which the Muslims have now been crying for the last 14 years was the substitution of Muslim minorities in the Punjab and in Bengal

for the small Muslim majorities. Had our friends the least vision of the future they would not have given the Punjab a practical and Bengal a deliberate and a small minority. It is to *rectify these mistakes that the Round Table Conference is practically being held. Let there be no mistake about it.* This is what His Majesty's Government and the Prime Minister should primarily understand. It is with this that I should have begun this long dissertation ; but I am glad I have come to it now after *clearing the site for laying down the foundation* and I will not take very long. The real problem before us is to give full power to Muslims in such provinces as those in which they are in a majority, whether small or large, and protection to them in such provinces as those in which they are in a minority, and in order to be absolutely fair to the Hindu Community also, precisely the same thing must be done with the Hindus. What is needed is to give power to a community which is in majority in any province no matter how small or how large it may be, and protection to it in a province no matter how large or small it may be. The Mussulmans desire—*and this is the crux of their 14 points* and not *separate electorates*—that there should be federal government so that the central unitary Government with a permanent Hindu majority should not override them everywhere ; they should have at least a third of the British Indian representation in the Federal Government, that in the province of the Punjab and Bengal where they have small majorities in population which are unorganised, and greatly controlled by the Banyas and the Sikhs and the Hindu landlords, as in Bengal, those majorities should be reserved (personally I shall be satisfied if for a number of years only such as 20) ; that in the N.W.F.P. and in Baluchistan (which is only nominally a Province) where there are clearly huge Muslim majorities full reforms should be extended to the Muslims which have so far been denied by the combination of British, military and civil domination and Hindu narrowness characteristically supporting it, and that Sind should be made a separate small province like Assam ; and that the Muslims should be allowed to have their majorities in all these as the Hindus have everywhere else. Unless in these few provinces

Muslim majorities are established by the new constitution, I submit, not as a *threat*, but as a very humble and friendly *warning*, there will be civil war in India. *Let there be no mistake about that*. These are the four or five Provinces where the Muslims should have precisely the same *power* as the Hindus have everywhere else, and the Hindus should have the same *protection* as the Muslims demand where they are in minorities.

In the Punjab and Bengal where the Muslim majorities are only 6 and 5 it *is absolutely impossible* to give any weightage to the Sikhs or to the Europeans, and neither of them needs weightage, as I shall presently explain. The whole idea has been created in order to rob the Muslims of their small majorities in the only two large Provinces where their population gives it to them, the franchise in both these Provinces, *whether equal for all communities or not*—this is not a religious or an ethical question about which there should be no rigidity and no fetish, and at present there is no rigidity about the franchise about the different communities in India (compare the franchise about the Council of State to-day)—should be such as to give the Mussulmans as many voters at least as their population ratio, and in any case their seats should at least for 20 years be reserved in the same proportion for them because they are indebted to the Hindu banias and too much under the influence of the Sikh *naveau richi*. The Nehru Report very ingeniously tried to fool the Mussulmans by talking of adult franchise. Nobody can be more in favour of adult franchise than a true Mussulman. But fortunately or unfortunately women become adults as well as men, and for 20 years at least Muslim women when they become adults will not go to the polling booths even if the best *purdah* arrangements are made for them, and only *purdah* officers supervise over their voting. In comparison with the Aryas, other Hindus and Sikhs in the Punjab, the Muslim women are bound to suffer. Therefore adult franchise is out of the question. In these two Provinces of the Punjab and Bengal, no consideration should go against the Muslim demand of a majority of 56 per cent and 55 per cent respectively in the entire House.

The Sikhs had acquired in that one generation of rule so much land in the Punjab and they exercise such control over the poor tenants and others in the villages to this day, that they need absolutely no protection. Time after time they have themselves said that if the Mussulmans give up "communalism" in the interests of "nationalism," they too would give up communalism and abide by the results of the general territorial elections. Robbed of all false sentiment this means that they do need protection in the same way as the Mussulmans do, and therefore the idea of providing weightage for them is wholly unnecessary and is a Hindu Mahasabha fiction.

The same may be said of the Europeans in Bengal. It is not for a few seats more or less in the Bengal Council only that they would keep their control over commerce that they have acquired since the John Company. We must provide for that in some other way, and I suggest that the Instrument of Instructions for the Governor of Bengal should provide that nothing should be done in India to wreak revenge against Europeans whatever Indians may feel for the past. A mere weightage of 3 or 10 per cent will not help them. It will be absolutely ineffective. What it will do will be to rob the Mussulmans of their majority in another of the only two provinces in which at present they are a majority in the population and have reforms.

With regard to the Frontier Province I say nothing, because the Frontier Committee is already dealing with the matter and my own suggestion is that the Muslims should give the Hindus and the Sikhs not only twice as much representations as the latter's population but three times as much, so that the Hindus and the Sikhs should feel that the province is their own as well as of the Mussulmans and that they have a share in the government of the Province. This is the kind of thing that the Mussulman should feel in Dr. Moonje's Province where he is only 4 per cent, or in Madras where he is only 7 per cent, or in Orissa when it is to be separated when he will be in an equally small proportion. *It must be remembered that the feeling for or against the Mussulmans in every Province is practically the same,*

and when it is so bitter in the Punjab it is not likely to be less bitter in Provinces like Dr. Moonje's where he is in very small numbers and practically a Hindu Government will rule over him. *The fear is that the idea of revenge is too much in the minds of our young men who have been mistaught Indian History chiefly for political reasons.*

It is only in the Indian States where history is not taught but it is still being made by the Princes and made in a human manner in spite of the weakness of Princes, to which I must refer as a confirmed republican, but true protection is offered to be found for the Mussulmans.

Let me in passing refer to the fact that the Mussulman has not been made excessively popular to any other minority either by 1,250 years of rule that he has exercised. Some have a grievance against him because he conquered Persia ! Some have a grievance against him because he conquered Byzantium, Syriya and Egypt and did not lose Palestine in the Crusades ! At any rate, whosover has ruled over India, whether it be the English or the Mussulman is bound in some way to suffer from real or imaginary grievances of his old subjects.

It is remarkable that the Mussulman suffer much less from it than the British. The British can be the best judge of this feeling of revenge against him, and in making a new constitution they must provide against that feeling for at least a number of years.

I come now to the subject of protection for the minorities. Many of the 14 points provide for this, such as a veto given to two-thirds of the Hindu and Muslim minorities in any legislative or other elected body against the discussion or passage of any bill, resolution, or part thereof, which is considered by it to be against its *interests*. This is the historic provision made by the Congress when the late Sir Syed Ahmed Khan of Aligarh was being invited in 1887 to join the Congress by Mr. Badruddin Tyabji, the other distinguished Mussulman who had joined the Congress. A provision that the Parliament of India before it

was recognised and had any real power except to debate, willingly legislated should not now be objected to when the Parliament of India is being recognised and being given effective power. *I insist that the words should be copied from the Congress Constitution itself.*

It must be remembered that this provision is not for the protection of any *religion* but of *communal interests* only. *Religion* must be above law, and I am sorry I had just been out of the Plenary Committee when the Prime Minister asked us about the Federal Committee's report whether we should note the point that no legislation should be introduced affecting the religion or religious rites and usages of any of His Majesty's subjects without the previous assent of the Governor. Already much mischief has been done by that provision on account of the passage of the Sarda Act for which although it had been passed, no assent was ever taken, the assent being given for a purely......Bill as originally introduced. I have not the least objection if the Hindus or members of any other *progressive* religion desire to legislate about their religions. But any religion is *not* "progressive". It claims divine legislation, as I have shown in the statement presented on the 9th November 1929, to His Excellency the Viceroy by the deputation of Muslim Ulama and leaders which I led before His Excellency of which I submit a copy with this statement of mine. Matters of such importance must not be rushed through in such hurry, and when opportunity arises again I shall see to it that at least Muslim religion is placed above human legislation whether by the Indian or by the British Parliament. Without that no Mussulman can undertake to be loyal to any constitution.

I would say one word only with reference to the weightage that the Muslims enjoy and desire to enjoy in every province where they are in such meagre minorities. Nowhere does that weightage give them a majority. As Shakespeare says about the Jews, it can be said of minorities that sufferance is the badge of the tribe ! But everywhere weightage gives them a certain amount of influence. And the need of that influence

is realised by no one more than by myself who, through my illness, have had the whole of my party unpresented in the Minorities Committee and elsewhere at present. Weightage will give to the community just so excessively represented only the idea that is has a share in the governance of the country and no more. The same weightage that the Muslims claim they are prepared to give to the Hindus in every Province in which the Hindus are in a similar minority. But to claim weightage for the Hindus of Bengal or of the Punjab where the minority is in reality better organised and in every way more powerful politically than the majority more wealthy and better educated is an absurdity. The same is true of the Sikhs in the Punjab, who, apart from every other consideration, are socially Hindus and have politically been working with them. In Sind the Hindu minority is better organised and richer and better educated than the Mussulmans in spite of their being big landlords, and yet I would give them a weightage as large as could satisfy the biggest gourmand.

Let it not be understood that I am a communalist in the sense in which communalism has been understood in Europe. Although nearly a generation ago I was one of the authors of the separate electorate. I have felt that the time for it has passed, and that we should now have, in the interest of Indian nationalism, a mixed territorial electorate. *But a territorial electorate in India of the type of England is an absurdity.* In the province, say of Dr. Moonje, or of Nawab Sir Abdul Qayum, where the minority communities number only 4 and 7 per cent. respectively, the minorities have no chance of getting their true representatives elected even if 20 seats are reserved for them, if 96% or 93% of the rival community are to be allowed to choose *their* representatives. Men of straw, men are merely *religiously* Hindu or Muslim, but not *politically* so, will be returned by the votes of politically Muslim and Hindu majorities.

I have therefore after long cogitation and consultation with friends devised a plan. It is certainly far more deserving of

consideration than Major Attlee's plan discussed in the Simon Report. It is this. Let the seats be reserved for the two communities but let no candidate be declared elected unless he secures :

(1) at least 40 per cent. of votes cast of his own community : and

(2) at least 5 per cent. of the votes cast of other communities wherever he is in a minority or 10 or less per cent. and 10 per cent. where he is in a larger minority or in a majority.

In this way *three* purposes will be served. In the *first* instance, every candidate will have to go cap in hand to both the communities as in the Minto-Morely Reforms which he does not do to-day ; and the rank abuse of sister communities which goes on to-day since the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, which had ruined Indian politics, and even social life, will cease. *Secondly*, no man would be returned to represent any community who does not represent at least a fair percentage of that community though not necessarily its majority as in the separate electorates to-day. The *third* purpose which is no less important is that ordinarily no person who is not in the least a *persona grata* to a sister community will be able to get returned even if he secures election from his own community. *Thus for the first time communalism will be killed* and true nationalism will get a chance. This is better than P.R. and distinctly better than the "list system". If, however, no candidate from a constituency satisfies either of these minima, the one that secures the largest votes cast of the community for which the seat is reserved must be retured. This will only be the relic of the present separate electorates which is unfortunately inevitable to-day. I do not want any more than that portion of separate electorates to be spared in the new national constitution that we are trying to frame this time in England. Without those conditions Mussulmans will never accept mixed electorates in which a man of straw or even a

false convert can be returned by the votes of 96 per cent. of the majority community in any province irrespective of the entire opposition of the community for which the candidate is standing for election as a representative. That will be an absurdity worse than any we have known.

I have explained this system both to His Excellency the Viceroy and to the Secretary of State for India and they were very gravely impressed with the sanity and ingenuity of the measure I proposed. I believe, I have a right to mention that Sir T.B. Sapru and the Right Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri have been equally impressed if not more.

With these words I close this statement of mine which has been dictated through the kindness of the Prime Minister and Sir Geoffrey Corbett in absolute defiance of my doctors who are greatly displeased with the liberty I have taken, and yet if I had not taken this liberty I should have disobeyed them still more greatly and would have gone to the Conference to put this case before the Committee and the Conference even if I died. I beg the Prime Minister and the Committee not to ignore this lengthy *script* but to give it some consideration at least. I can assure them that it represents the views of *many scores of millions of Muslims* whose voice may not be heard in the Indian Round Table Conference but whose sentiments cannot be ignored by the Indian administrators as I feel sure Sir Geoffrey Corbett, who has been present throughout, knows well enough himself.

I remain,
Your obediently,
(Sd.) MOHAMED ALI

6

MAULANA SHAUKAT ALI

[Though the elder member of the team of the well-known Ali Brothers, Maulana Shaukat Ali (1874-1938) has a place of his own in the galaxy of eminent Muslim freedom fighters of modern India. He did graduation from the M.A.O. College, Aligarh, in 1894 and was chosen as a member of Sir Syed Memorial Fund Committee four years after which provided an appropriate outlet for his oratorical talents. But what made the Ali Brothers very popular was their arrest during the days of the first World War for their advocacy of the interest of the Muslim countries through their writings in the *Comrade* and the *Hamdard.* Their open support for the Ottoman Empire and for the office of the Sultan of Turkey was taken as seditious by the British government on account of Turkey's being an enemy country in the first World War. The release of the Ali Brothers in December, 1918 was widely hailed and the two Alis took part in the sessions of the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League held at Amritsar in 1919. With his younger brother (Mohammed Ali), Shaukat Ali led a deputation to the Viceroy in Delhi and then to the Prime Minister in London with a demand that no portion of the Arabian peninsula having holy shrines of Muslims be handed over to the non-Muslim powers. It meant that the Turkish Empire and the office of the Caliph (Khalifa) should remain intact. The second internment of the Ali Brothers on the charge of inciting Moplah revolt in 1921 once again brought their names into lime-light. But the Khilafat Movement failed and after that the two Alis fought valiantly for the interests of the Muslims. They even said many things against the policy of the Indian National Congress that looked like a contradiction of what they had said.

earlier when they were so close to it. The younger Ali died in 1931 and thereafter the elder one continued to fight for the cause of the Indian Muslims till the end of his life.]

LETTER TO THE VICEROY

Chhindwara (C P.)
April 24, 1919

Your Excellency,

We have now after repeated representations received a communication in which the Government has embodied the findings of the Committee appointed by it in September, 1918, to inquire into the case of our internment, and also the decision of Government rejecting the Committee's recommendation.

2. From a Committee so unfairly constituted, and an investigation conducted with such utter disregard of all civilised judicial procedure, no one, and least of all we, who had protested against both at the very outset, could have expected anything better. Nor could any one acquainted with the inner history of our internment when it was ordered four years ago, and knowing how, under the existing system of administration, private caprice so often parades itself in the garb of public considerations, have any occasion for surprise in the fact that even after the Committee's advice urging our release, Government should decline to restore us to liberty.

3. Since no methods have yet been discovered in assessing the value of personal freedom, it is not possible for us to communicate to another an exact idea of what we lost when we lost our liberty. Nor is it possible for others to gauge the mental anguish we have endured in four years of exile, or the cumulative effect of the daily vexations of a detenu's life. The only form of loss that is capable of any precise indication is monetary and when it is understood that one result of our internment, and that the least serious, was that we were made

to sustain the loss of two and a half lakhs of rupees in the last four years, some idea may be formed of the punitive character of a measure for which it has repeatedly been claimed on behalf of Government that it is purely precautionary.

4. Incidentally, Government's dealings with us in these matters provide a fair enough test for judging whether our internment was due solely to public considerations. It is conceivable that public safety may need the restriction of a man's freedom in times of great stress an imminent danger to the State. But it could not conceivably need his financial ruin. To have deprived us of our liberty without just cause, and even without the semblance of an inquiry, was bad enough. But to have knowingly worried us with daily want, and to have forced our children, in spite of our repeated remonstrances, to grow up almost in ignorance for want of funds where with to educate them, was worse. One may attempt, if he so desires, to reconcile tyranny with public considerations ; but meanness goes well only with malice.

5. However, the loss of one's business and the resulting privations may be borne along with the more grievous loss of personal liberty ; and we may well console ourselves for all the disabilities and discomforts that we have patiently borne all these years with reflection that neither we nor our fellow countrymen need be ashamed of our conduct during our prolonged internment. But no Government was expected in the twentieth century to claim even by implication, the right to force a man's conscience. And yet it is only on this hypothesis that the action of Government with respect to the internment of Moslem *Ulama* and public workers, and the virtual suppression of the entire Moslem Press, culminating in the forfeiture of Dr. Ansari's address becomes intelligible.

6. As for ourselves, there was at one time much talk of the discovery of some treasonable correspondence of ours with His late Majesty the Ameer of Afghanistan, and with our spiritual preceptor, Maulana Abdul Bari Saheb of Firangi

Mahal, Lucknow, just when our release seemed to be in sight. But when immediately on hearing of it we openly challenged Government to produce these letters, this talk came very soon to subside. When a year later a statement of the reasons for our internment and for the refusal to release us was furnished to us, this preposterous accusation did not make its appearance at all But this alone could not satisfy us. Unwilling to tolerate any longer a constant shifting of the ground on the part of our accusers, we demanded from the Committee of Inquiry when it came here to examine us a searching investigation into the matter, so that one lie at least might be nailed to the counter. But all the satisfaction that we could obtain was the information, that, in spite of an abundance of vague and undefined charges, not a word had been mentioned before the Committee on the subject of so grave and definite an accusation. Nevertheless we pressed our demand for an inquiry into what must have been a diabolical forgery ; but since we have not yet been furnished with the Committee's report, we are unable to say whether it did its obvious duty by instituting a searching inquiry into the matter, or merely manipulated the so-called evidence secretly furnished to it, though never disclose to us, in order to arrive at such eminently convenient results.

7. We are not, however, concerned here with anything beyond the one clear reason on which Government has publicly based its justification of our internment. And it is nothing but our freely expressing and promoting sympathy with our Moslem brethren, and maintaining our allegiance to the Caliph of our Prophet (on whom be God's benedictions and peace) and Commander of the Faithful. This as the reason given in September 1917, for restrictions having been originally imposed on us in May, 1915, and for the refusal to modify the orders nearly two and a half years later. This again ran through all the vague and flimsy charges regarding the Khuddam-i-Ka'ba Society and Pan-Islamism furnished to us in November, 1918. And, finally this is the only justification now communicated to us alike for the Committee's findings and its recommendation and the Government's rejection of its advice urging our release.

We were interned because we freely expressed and promoted a sympathy and maintained an allegiance demanded from us by our Islamic faith. We were not released along with Mrs. Besant and her co-workers because of this sympathy and this allegation of allegiance. And now that the Committee has found this internment four years go, and for the subsequent refusal to release us, even the advice tendered by it to Government that we should now be released is itself based on the belief that neither the one nor the other can "interfere with the relations between Great Britain and Turkey". Finaly, the Government rejects the advice and refuses to release us, because, thank God, "there has been no change whatever in the attitude of the brothers" but because we are as staunch as ever in our faith in Islam and all that it implies, and hold the same view of honest Imperial policy as before, the destinies of the Empire as well as those of the Caliphate must be settled behind our backs, while we are still bound hand and foot and gagged into the bargain in the interest of the Empire, and presumably also of Islam's safety.

8. Viewing the matter even from the lower plane of politics, we now ask Your Excellency, what can be the significance of the Empire to an Indian if the mere expression of his opinion, declared by no court of law to be unlawful, with respect to a far-reaching settlement of the Empire's future relations with another Empire, involving, as they must, his own and his country's happiness or misery, prosperity or ruin, are permitted to be declared by the Executive and its nominees to be an "interference" and almost a crime ! Such a doctrine if allowed to remain unchallenged would reduce the Imperial idea to the meanest trickery ; for in the name of the Empire we shall continue to be asked to sacrifice not only wealth and life, but also our eternal salvation, and the only return that we shall continue to receive would be fetters and a gag. If this is to be the standardised value of Imperial Citizenship, then we have clearly reached a stage when every Indian subject of His Majesty' should seriously reconsider his bargain.

9. Looking at the matter, however, from the viewpoint of faith, this denial of liberty to "interfere with the relations between Great Britain and Turkey—in other words, between the State and the Church of Islam—is itself nothing short of interference in a most vital matter of faith. Since Government cannot even now, when the eternal pretence of the war can no longer be pleaded as an excuse, restore to a Mussulman the liberty which he should never have lost, on the solitary ground that "there has been no change whatever in his attitude" in a vital matter of a faith, and he is as unwilling as ever to prejudice his eternal salvation for swearing the creed that demands from the expression and promotion of sympathy with his brothers in faith, and the maintenance of his allegiance to the Commander of the Faithful, we are irresistibly driven to ask ourselves whether, consistently with our creed and its universally acknowledged implications, we and other Indian Mussalmans can any longer remain under British subjection.

10. For four long years we retained the fetters placed on our feet and did not remove the gag from our mouths. But what occurred during the four years of war with Turkey, and, still more, what is now being enacted at the Peace Conference, makes it obligatory that the eal of silence must be broken and Government must be made to realise the extreme gravity of the issue that is being forced on the Moslem subjects of His Majesty.

11. Moslem loyalty and support had so often been assured to Government in our generation, and even Moslem contentment was so often unduly taken for granted, that other communities had with some justice made our attitude towards Government almost a matter of reproach. It was a strange return for all his loyalty and support, that, without any effective protest, and often with the concurrence of His Majesty's Government, blow after blow was aimed at the temporal power of Islam. As a prominent Anglo-Indian newspaper admitted, "at all points the independent dominion

of the Moslem was hemmed in and threatened, and the future seemed dark for its continuance in any part of the world". Government could not have been unaware of the sorrow and suffering that all this entailed for the Mussalmans of India. No section of the community remained unaffected or unmoved, and princes in their palaces and peasants in their huts alike passed anxious days and sleepless nights. Our public servants, that already carry on their shoulders the main burden of Indian administration so ungrudgingly and on such poor remuneration, and are yet so inordinately subservient to superior authority, and the very policemen, who are too often assumed to have no human sensibilities beyond the one lively desire to serve the bureaucracy and at its bidding denounce every fellow-countryman, of independent views--they, too, felt the shock of these successive blows, when Europe went on battering and disintegrating the temporal power of Islam, and threatened, the Caliphate itself with isolation and rapid decay.

12. It was not, however, the fear of losing political dominance that troubled the Mussalmans most. The spiritual force of Islam does not depend on political supremacy, and for the most vital tradition of our faith is the humble beginning of Islam in the midst of hostile elements of extraordinary potency and malice, and the ceaseless persecution of our Prophet during the greater part and—of his prophetic carreer, a tradition that was revived and rejuvenated by the martyrdom of his grandson, Husain, with his little band of two and seventy heroes on the ever memorable field of Kerbala. What the cruel occurrences in Tripoli and the Balkans, at Holy Meshed and Tabriz, had led Mussalmans to apprehend was that the temporal power of Islam might be so weakened that it might become liable to suffer, without adequate power to prevent, the curtailment of its spiritual influence through the pressure of the temporal power of rival creeds.

13. The Moslem Press of India did every thing in its power to warn Government against the disastrous consequences of the policy it seemed bent on pursuing, and no method was

left untried of impressing on Great Britain that if she desired to retain the goodwill of the Mussulmans, a hundred millions of whom were members of her composite Empire, she must be friend and keep the Caliphate on her side, and deal more fairly and equitably with Moslem Kingdoms and countries such as Persia, Afghanistan and Morocco. But none of these warnings was heeded. The result was inevitable, and when war was declared between Great Britain and Turkey, some sort of an apologia as well as assurance was left to be needed.

14. On the authority of his Majesty's Government Your Excellency's predecessor gave a most solemn pledge "in regard to the Holy Places of Arabia, including the Holy Shrines of Mesopotamia and the port of Jeddah, in order that there may be no misunderstanding on the part of His Majesty's most loyal Moslem subjects as to the attitude of His Majesty's Government in this War". This pledge was to the effect that "these Holy Places and Jeddah will be immune from attack or molestation by the British military and naval forces" ; and it was supplemented by the announcement that "at the request of His Majesty's Government, the Governments of France and Russia had given similar assurance". Nevertheless it is now admitted that "a close blockade of the coast of the Red Sea was instituted"; and it is clear that the Arabs of the holiest of the Holy Places of Islam were threatened with certain starvation in order to compel them to revolt against their temporal sovereign and renounce the allegation which they owed under the law of Islam to the legitimate successor of the Arabian Prophet. The chronicler of the *Times* newspaper adds that subsequently "events were so far advanced as to warrant a landing of arms at Rebegh", a coast town on the pilgrim route midway between the Sacred Harems of Mecca. Later, "a meeting took place with one of the sons of the Emir and Grand Sheriff of Mecca", and "the die was cast by the Grand Sheriff for revolt". At British instigation, and presumably with British support, even if the precise nature of it has not been disclosed in India the forces of the Servant of the Holy Places were attacked at Mecca, and the garrison fell into the hands of the renegades.

Then began the siege of Jeddah, the port of Mecca explicitly included in the British pledge and Allied assurance of immunity, and here it is announced, without any apparent qualms, that the renegades had the assistance of "the supporting British warships". It is said that they "could not approach nearer than 2000 to 3000 yards and inevitable mirage made the shooting difficult". "Religious prejudice" — such is the phrase — "forbade the landing of a spotting officer". But — and this is sufficiently significant of the entire business — "towards the end, when the ships' surgeons had ministered to the wounded Arabs, this latter difficulty was overcome'. It is needless to pursue any further this chronicle of the manner in which a solemn pledge was kept in the case of Jeddah "in the spirit and the latter Medina, the Sacred Harem of our Prophet, resisted the renegades of Mecca to the last; so its surrender had to be provided for directly by the British in the terms of the armistice forced on the Servant of the Holy Places; and even then his forces had to be made to evacuate the Sacred Harem by means of a British threat. The third Sacred Harem of Jerusalem was attacked practically by British forces alone.

* * * *

19. The war is now over; but the spirit of tyranny that it generated is still abroad and while, on the one hand, it is being proclaimed in high sounding phrases that those who are assembled at Paris to decide the destinies of the world on a more equitable and humane basis than Brute Force, are not the master of the people but their servants, the Government, on the other hand, is denying to the people of India even the latest expression of opinion on questions that vitally concern them. Not only is the gag not to be removed yet from our own mouths, but a gag of prodigious proportions has been prepared from now for silencing more than three hundred millions of God's articulate creatures. The Rowlatt Bill just enacted in the most tyrannical manner has ended the reign of law and substituted a reign of terror in its place, and although it affects every section of the people of India, the Mussalmans are certain to be its first, and its worst victims. It has been

the Moslem Press that has suffered most under the Press Act; and the same has been true of the Defence of India Act, if we only exclude the unfortunate young men of Bengal routing in solitary cells or swampy island without trial or hope of release. Even those who profess a pathetic optimism, and hope against hope that the bureaucracy armed with the strength of the giant will not use it as tyrannically as the giant, need only have access to our own experience to be cured of this distressing delusion. We, who have already had enough experience of "Executive discretion", and of "investigating authorities", sitting in camera, partially inquiring into undefined charges, and dealing with undisclosed "evidence" without the help of any code or procedure or law of evidence, submitting reports that cannot bear the light of the day, and being finally dismissed as ignorant persons for all their paths, can claim to speak with some authority, and say that the "Black Act" is nothing more or less than the virtual outlawry.

20. The forfeiture of Dr. Ansari's address which should have been placed by Government with its fullest support on the table of the Peace Conference as an authoritative exposition of Islamic law on the subjects of the Caliphate, the Jazeerat-ul-Arab and the Holy Places, and which was replete with Quranic texts and the Prophet's Traditions, is sure to create the impression that Government is not only anxious to keep the Moslems muzzled when their fate is being discussed and decided by men of other creeds, but that India itself is no longer safe for Islam and its free exposition. But has the Government realised to what this would undoubtedly lead? When a land is not safe for Islam a Moslem has only two alternatives—*Jehad* or *Hijrat*. That is to say, he must either make use of every force God has given him for the liberation of the land and the ensurement of perfect freedom for the practice and preaching of Islam, or he must migrate to some other and freer land with a view to return to his Motherland when it is once more safe for Islam. This is no new doctrine, but as old as the eventful *Hijrat* of the Prophet thirteen hundred years ago, in which the Moslem Era had its birth, and from which it takes its name.

21. In view of our weak condition, migration is the only alternative for us ; and if we are forced either to forswear our faith ; or leave our Motherland, we could only migrate from this great country to which Islam brought its blessings more than twelve hundred years ago. A Mussalman is required by his faith, which is catholic and universal, to maintain an extraordinary detachment from country and race. But Islam is firmly based on the solid rock of human nature, and we are neither required to cultivate, nor have we in fact cultivated an unnatural indifference to the land we live in, or to the good people who inhabit it along with us. Millions of ties that have been formed in our twelve century long sojourn in India would seek to keep us tied down to it, and when we migrate, as we must, the minarets of our mosques would continue to beckon to us, and their domes, that would resound no more with the cries of "God is Greatest", would by their very silence recall us to them. And even if we proved unresponsive to the fraternal calls of the living, the non-Moslem compatriots with whom we have for so many centuries wrought for the good of our Motherland, and have together developed India's marvellous Arts and Culture, the graves of our ancestors would exercise over us their spiritual spell. But a greater call would make us leave this dear land of ours—never dearer than now that we would be taking our leave of it—for it would be the imperative call of religious duty. But when it is understood that we shall be leaving it only in order to work for its liberation from lawless laws and the restoration of all its rights and privileges as the land of the free that God had made it, and that it is destined soon to be, we do not fear we shall be accused of want of patriotism or of desertion in the hour of its peril. Our mosques and the bones of our ancestors we shall entrust to the loving and reverential care of our non-Moslem fellow countrymen ; and God in His beneficence and infinite mercy has not left us in these wonderful days without many convincing proofs that this sacred trust will be in safe and deserving hands.

22. This step, which we shall now have to consider with all the seriousness that its very nature demands, will be perhaps the most decisive in the history of our community since the *Hijrat* of our Holy Prophet. Discouraging and bitterly painful as our experience has been in recent years, we feel that before we finally take it one more opportunity must be given to the Government to review its attitude towards the people, and to see the drift of its policy of negation of Swadharma, in addition to the neglect of Swadeshi and denial of Swarajya.

23. We have so far studiously refrained from referring to more exclusively political affairs, though true politics, which comprises all public activities of mankind, is to us, as it is to our guide, philosopher and friend, Mahatma Gandhi, as much a part of our religion as the Moslem demand for the restoration of the Holy Places of Islam. Every legitimate claim must rest on the basis of Truth, and the Truth is nothing but Faith. We therefore wholeheartedly identify ourselves with the clear and emphatic political demand of the country for constitutional reform and the better ensurement of our civic rights as voiced by the Indian National Congress and the All-India Moslem League, now happily working together for the commonweal. Having done this, we may for the present safely leave the advocacy of these general Indian claims in the hands of such great leaders of the people as Mahatma Gandhi, Lokmanaya Tilak and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, and other Congress-men and members of the League.

24. We have now only to define the more particularly Moslem demands though we are happy in the belief that they are no longer exclusively urged by the Mussalmans of India, but have received from our fellow countrymen of other creeds also a firm pledge of support even unto death. These demands are as follows :

I. There should never be any attempt to interfere by pressure or persuasion in the free choice by the Mussalmans of the Caliph of their Prophet.

II. No Mussalman, whether a soldier or a civilian, should be asked to assist in any manner whatsoever in the prosecution of war, or of any other hostile design, against the Caliph, when he has declared a *Jehad* in the exercise of the functions of the Caliphate and such assistance has become *haram* thereafter according to the law of Islam ; and any Mussalman undergoing at present any form of punishment for the refusal to render such assistance should be given complete amnesty.

III. No part of the territories included in the expression Jazeerat-ul-Arab, as defined by the Moslem religious authorities and lexicographers should be directly or indirectly occupied, or subject to any form of non-Moslem control, but must remain as heretofore under independent Moslem occupation and control, as required by the testamentary injunction of the Holy Prophet ; and the present occupation and control of every portion of such territories opposed to the letter or the spirit of this injunction should forthwith cease.

IV. There should be no attempt to remove, whether directly or indirectly, from the independent, indivisible and inalienable sovereignty of the Caliph, who is the recognised Servant of the Holy Places and Warden of the Holy Shrines, any portion of the territories in which such Holy Places and Shrines are situated, including, without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing expressions, the territories in which are situated three Sacred Harems of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem, and the Holy Shrines in Najaf, Kerbela, Baghdad, Kazimain, Sameana, Constantinople and Konieh ; and such territories should forthwith be evacuated by the forces of His Majesty and of the Allied and Associated Governments and restored to the Caliph, the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire.

V. Nor should there be any such attempt to dismember and parcel out and even among Moslem Governments, or in any other manner weaken the Caliph's Empire with the object of weakening the temporal power of Islam, and thereby make it liable to suffer, without adequate power to prevent the curtail-

ment of its spiritual influence through the pressure of the temporal power of other creeds.

VI. His Majesty's Government should restore to the Caliph the Vilayat of Egypt, so that it may once more be an integral portion of his empire, and it should make determined efforts to induce other powers also to restore similar such other territories, like Bosnia-Herzegovina and Tripoli, and they have forcibly been taken from him ; and similar justice should be done in case of other Moslem territories like those of Algiers, Tunis, Morocco, the Caucasus and the Khanates and Kingdoms of Central Asia.

VII. If, as a result of the Peace Conference, the principle of Self-Determination is also to be applied to the inhabitants of any territory, it should also be applied to the inhabitants of all territories that have been under Ottoman and other Moslem Governments ; and the agency for ascertaining the result of such self-determination, which should be proportionally Moslem, should include Indian Mussalmens, such as Rulers of Moslem Indian States, divines and political leaders, to be selected by the All-India Moslem League ; and the Moslem delegation should be free to act in the aforesaid territories on the divine injunction : "Verily all Moslems are brothers ; wherefore make peace between your brothers."

VIII. No Mussalman should in any manner be deprived of his liberty, or otherwise punished, molested or disquieted by reason of his expressing and promoting sympathy with his brother Mussalmans in any part of the world, or maintaining and strengthening the allegiance of all Mussalmans to the Caliph of the Holy Prophet, and Commander of the Faithful ; and all persons thus dealt with should be forthwith set at Liberty ; and all newspapers suppressed for a like reason should be permitted free publication and all monetary losses sustained by any persons or newspapers through such action of Government should be made good.

IX. Greater respect should be paid in the future to the universal sentiment of Indian Mussalmans ; that determined

efforts should be made by British Imperial authorities to earn the good-will and cultivate the friendship of Moslem Governments, such as those of Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan and Morocco, by countenancing whether on the part of His Majesty's Government or of others, no dealings that are not open, fair and equitable ; and as an earnest of this policy, such Moslem Governments should not be excluded from any of the benefits of any organisation such as the projected League of Nations, but should be made equal participants therein along with other Governments.

We are,
Your Excellency's Faithfully,
SHAUKAT ALI,
MOHAMED ALI.

His Excellency the Viceroy and
Governor-General of India,
Simla.

IN DEFENCE OF KHILAFAT*

'Allah-o-Akbar'. Brothers,—It is a matter of great happiness to me that with your permission, in my capacity as President of this year's All-India Khilafat Conference held at Cocanada, I am in a position to express my views about the stupendous work we have before us. You may be knowing that when released from the Betul jail, we Mohammed Ali and myself, both went straight to Amritsar which had become an important battlefield after the Jallianwala tragedy. You had done me the great honour of electing me as President of the Khilafat Conference in my absence this time. When I was in jail, I very much wanted that you should once more confer upon me this great honour this year also. We could not get any news from outside the jail. Nevertheless, accounts of the

*Presidential address at the All-India Khilafat Conference held at Cocanada on 27 December, 1923.

relaxation of efforts, and unpleasant communal disturbances did reach us from time to time. But I assure you, in spite of the iron gates of the jail and its four walls, never was I dismayed nor did I lose heart for a minute. On the contrary, I always felt that the real time of work had at last arrived. It was for this reason that I looked forward to your conferring upon me the honour of electing me your President a second time so that I might be able to relate before you and the world at large the feelings that surged in my heart in the hope that these feelings of mine might perhaps touch the proper chord in your hearts.

"Having heard my story, they are pleased,
"I hear now that they have sent for a story-teller."

I am grateful to my dear brother and friend, Dr. Kitchlew, and also to my revered brother and companion of the Karachi jail, Pir Ghulam Mujadid Saheb, who, through some mysterious telepathic influences, divided my innermost feelings and withdrew their candidature for the Presidentship of this Conference.

I hope I can rely on your indulgence if by way of digression I avail myself of this opportunity to tell you that, after a continued experience and close companionship of almost four years I have found in my brother Saifuddin Kitchlew a sincere, honest, selfless, and undaunted and intrepid worker. Alongwith others he and I were co-Secretaries of the Central Khilafat Committee. We lived in the same room and were thrown together all the twentyfour hours of the day. In each other's constant company I had full control over all the activities and, instead of being an impediment in the way his services were at all times ungrudgingly placed at my disposal. I doubt if my own brother Mohammed Ali would have assisted me so loyally. God be thanked that even in these days of adversity, we have got amongst us men of such stamp and calibre who command the confidence and respect not only of the Punjab but of the whole of India. This is a meagre but

sincere acknowledgement of his services that I am making before you from this platform to-day. As to my revered brother Pir Ghulam Mujadid, is there any one amongst us here in this assembly to-day who, having met him once has not carried away with him an indelible impression on his heart of his undoubted sincerity, profound devotion, self-sacrifice and true Islamic fervour ? All these noble qualities were fully demonstrated in the jail at Karachi, and on coming out of the jail it gave me great pleasure to learn that the first man who gave wholehearted support to the resumption of Civil Disobedience was our brave Pir Saheb. Here is the man who, along with his hundreds of thousands of followers, will be the first to take the field and revive the old traditions of the simple and sincere Muslims of the decayed and pristine glories of Islam.

No Learned Sermon

Brothers, you are fully aware that I am neither a learned theologian nor can I claim to possess complete mastery of the political situation of the day. I have also no hesitation in confessing that in matters connected with the Khilafat and the Islamic world, many of my colleagues and co-workers possess greater knowledge than myself. There is however the thing which impelled me to entertain the ambition of presiding over the deliberation to-day and mentality of the generality of the Musalmans, there is none amongst my co-religionists who can claim greater knowledge than myself. I enjoy this privilege not only because I constantly came in contact with them, but also as I belong to their own class and lacking full knowledge in matters religious and secular. I unhesitatingly draw upon the learning of the Ulema on the one hand and the experience and sagacity of the political leaders on the other, and both have always ungrudingly placed their help and advice entirely at my disposal. Do not, gentlemen, therefore, expect to hear to-day a learned address replete with political wisdom and sagacity or full of minute intricacies respecting the legal and constitutional position of the Khilafat. What I will say will

be the story of the sufferings of the heart of a simple-minded Musalman who profits from experience and relies on his zeal and love for Islam and trusting God jumps into the fray regardless of consequences and renders whatever service he can.

'Oh Bulbul, keep on crying and bewailing'
'Oh guest of the cage, keep on entertaining the fowler'
'Be it wailing, crying or heart-burning sigh'
'Oh thou unhappy heart, keep on doing what thou can'st'

Hopes and Aspirations

Brothers, before I open to you the volumes of my hopes and aspirations regarding the work before us, I would like, with your permission, to reiterate plainly and in unequivocal terms, the views of my co-religionists to the British Government. These views are not the views of the learned and the educated section only, but they are the views of the man in the street. Also these ideas agitate the minds of every Muslim, man or woman, howsoever occupied he or she may be, at least once in 24 hours. Great Britain should clearly understand that sufferings and disasters have at last roused the Muslim world. Every fresh difficulty, hardship and calamity, every fresh plunder of a Muslim country, every fresh attempt at dissension among the faithful, no matter howsovever successful it may appear, shall have but one and only one result,—it will rouse the Muslims to a greater consciousness of their responsibilities and prepare them still better to discharge their duties as Muslim. I take back your minds to 1910 and 1911 and compare the then state of affairs with the conditions obtaining now. The years 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923 and what you see to-day is only the beginning of what is to follow. Greater difficulties are still ahead. Every Muslim now understands Great Britain.

Ask any Muslim in any part of the Globe—Who is the Greatest Enemy of Islam ? You will get only one reply—"Great Britain and the English Nation." I honestly and truly

declare that this answer is a correct one. We are not foolish children and cannot permit any one to pull wool over our eyes. We cannot be deceived by sweet words. Thank God, we have able men amongst us who are capable of shouldering the responsibilities of the most important of the chancellories of Europe. We are fully aware that it is due to the wrong Muslim policy of her ministers that her Empire is showing visible signs of disintegration and if our warning is not listened to, the result will be nothing but wreck and ruin. It is only the beginning.

Attempting the Impossible

To the British Government the President said : You may hang Maulana Abdul Kalam, impale Maulana Abdul Bari Sahib, crucify Maulana Abdul Majid, blow Dr. Kitchlew from the mouth of the gun, hack Hakim Ajmal Khan and Dr. Ansari to pieces, grind Mohammed Ali, Shaukat Ali and their friends to dust and scatter it to the winds so that no trace of it may be found anywhere, and along with these destroy that true and religious Hindu who fought shoulder to shoulder with the Muslims in their fight for religion because he believed and believes that in the war of right and wrong it is the duty of truly religious-minded persons to side with the righteous. Nay, bury alive that brave Sardar of Hindustan in Yerrowada or light the fire and burn him alive as a martyr on the funeral pile--do all this but you cannot kill this genuine movement. All such attempts will lead to the disruption of the Empire. I request you with all respect and if it be necessary with folded hands, not to ignore or treat us with indifference after our loud and repeated protests. This attitude will not benefit you in the long run. The time will come when you will be forced to accede to our demands and your belated acceptance of them will be of no avail, nor will it then help you to say that you did not know. We have told you many a time before and we repeat it once more that not all the Empires of the world, not all the wealth and treasure this earth holds, not all the kingdoms of the world, not even the choicest things this universe can boast of can hold against an inch, nay not even

an atom of the holy land of Jazirat-ul-Arab and the holy places. You have therefore to revise your foreign policy and change its orientation or else under the present circumstances there can be but one course left to a God-fearing Muslim, man or woman. So long as one inch of the Jazirat-ul-Arab is under non-Muslim influence, a Muslim cannot have peace of mind. To-day looking to our disorganised condition and weakness you may laugh at my assertions. You may treat our warning with contempt, set up against us any number of our weak-hearted Muslim brethren, including some of the so-called Ulema, strangle us with the brute force at your command. But just as the Divine existence cannot be obliterated by these puerile efforts, so also this movement set on foot by His humble devotees cannot be destroyed. The Holy Koran very clearly lays down for us :

> "They entertained the intention of puffing the Light of God, while He has determined to make it perfect, no matter how much the infidels take it ill".

> "My prayer, my virtue, my life, my death, my standing, my sitting, and my every work is for my real Master, my real King and for that Master who is the owner of both the worlds and is the Creator".

We had forgotton this teaching and hence had sided with you, helped you in the war and formed two-thirds of the army which wrested Jerusalem from the hand of the soldiers of Islam, the brave Turks and the Khalifatul Rasool, and handed it over to you. These unfortunate Musalmans had, for the paltry sum of ten or fifteen rupees, owing to their ignorance, disregarded the divine word and struck at the very root of Islam.

Never an Enemy

Although I was not your enemy before, now I am your enemy as well as of your Government. Believe me and don't listen to the advice of your councillors and flatterers. I pledge you that even in the heart of such flatterers comes the thought

of a Prophet and of God now and then, though not daily, and would also feel sorry like me. I feel sorry for these men and my heart grieves for them. I pray to God that just as He is kind on me and on you, so also would He brighten their hearts with a lightray that they may also join us throwing their caps in the air and shouting mad like 'Analhaq'. It is of course possible. To be hopeless of this fervour is a sin.

'We have never abstained from the commission of sin.'
'But God has never aggrieved our heart.'
'We tried our level best (to go to) the hell.'
'But Thine Kindness did not like it.'

My word may seem harsh to you but if you hear them with patience you would come to know that this is no bitter poison. On the other hand it contains the keynote of your Government and of your nationality. Mohammedans are now wide awake and the drowsiness has vanished away. Every day would see them taking long strides towards progress. Retrogression is now impossible. All the efforts of the enemies would surely prove fruitless. My God and His Koran never speaks false :

"Among the weakest houses the weakest is of a spider. All the efforts of the infidels and the heretics for deceiving the Mohammedans would be destroyed like the spider's web."

It is way my brother and my aged mother and like us many of our co-workers, are determining to enter the field in the name of God without caring a bit for life and do not take rest so long as we do not attain our aim.

'O ! Curiosity be happy for some good news is coming.
To-day the morning breeze is coming.'

I can say that in my childhood the first man who has produced any effect upon my heart was an Englishman whose name I am not ashamed to mention *viz.* Theodore Beck who has taught me and other young Mohammedans to dream the prosperity of Islam. And with it he had also taught me that

there should always exist friendship between the English and the Mohammedans. Since then I and my sect lived with the English people in the playground, clubs, meetings, and in every other thing. We have seen that after the Crimean War, either owing to the fear of Russia or for our sake Britain was considered as the friend of the Khalifa and of the Mohammedans, in 1911-1', I, with His Highness the Aga Khan, made a tour round India in the capacity of the Secretary of the Muslim University to gather a fund of thirty lakhs in order to fulfil the daily increasing conditions of the Government. I had then a great desire that the Emperor of India may press such an electric button at Delhi that the Royal Muslim University may spring up at Aligarh. For 17 years I have served in the Excise Department of the Government in the capacity of a high official. My notorious younger brother Mohammed Ali besides Aligarh, has also passed four years in the Oxford University and I know that he had great love for them Thousands of the Mohammedans of India by becoming faithful to this Government have lost many of their own rights and of their country, and having forgotten the teachings of the Koran, enlisted themselves in the army for the sake of 15 rupees and gave proof of their fidelity in cutting the throats of their own brethren in Afghanistan, Persia, Arabia, Syria, Egypt, Sudan, Somaliland, and in every country.

After all, would it not be proper for the Government to see why this great change has come up among Mohammedans instead of sending us to jails and putting us to torture?

Jazirat-ul-Arab

Was it really the fault of the Mohammedans or that having taken advantage of our ignorance, they have made us to destroy our religion with our own hand? Just think over your Islamic policy. Call to-day high responsible officials—Mian Mohammed Shafi, Sir Abdur Rahim, Mian Fazl-i-Husain, Nawab Sahib Chhatari, Nawab Ali Choudhri, Mr. Ghulam Husain Hedayet Ullah, Sir Habib Ullah of Madras, Ibrahim Rhamat Ullah of Bombay, and Dehlavi Sahib and ask them to

tell you whether the claims of the Central Khilafat Committee are in accordance with religion true or false. It is my belief that the only answer which would be given is this that the claims about the Khilafat, the Jazirat-ul-Arab, and holy places are word by word true. The safety of the Government lies in this that as soon as it is possible would retrace its steps and repent for its mistakes with a sincere heart. Even if the inhabitants of the Jazirat-ul-Arab ask you to live there, you should then leave them, go back to your own country, and never think of that barren desert again. Here lies your safety. In 1912 when Khuddam-i-Kaba was founded and when I was working under Maulana Abdul Bari as a Secretary. I saw the Deputy Commissioner of Delhi in that connection. At the very outset in order to influence my heart he expressed his anger with me and said, "When there is already Sahib Ahmar, then what is the use of Hilal Ahmar and what is this Khuddam-i-Kaba ?" When in response to this question my tongue began to utter words swiftly he said, "I can't follow you as you speak so swiftly. Speak slowly."

I laughed within myself and in reply showed my tongue to him and said "This is too thick. I cannot speak slowly. It is our misfortune that you have got a bad ear and a bad tongue." Such a talk from human dressed like myself had very sobering effect on him. He thought it better to change. After this I spoke to him plainly and said : "That land is all sand and rock lent to the Musalmans, it is dearer than the paradise itself and it was sure to prove a veritable hell to the non-Muslims casting covetous glances on it." At this he laughed heartily and said, "You need not be so very anxious. We have got Australia, Canada and a number of other colonies. We are inhabitants of a cold country. What shall we do with a hot country ? Why should we go there ?" I said : "You are welcome to your colonies, Australia, Canada and all. We have no designs against them." But no number of such conversations and writings can have any effect. The developments which took place after this interview are known to everyone. I should once more like to inform Great Britain in plain words that if they want to be at peace with the four hundred million Musulmans of the world, she

should leave Jerusalem, Mesopotamia, Hedjaz, Yemen, Nejd, Syria, Palestine, in short the whole of the Jazirat-ul-Arab to the inhabitants of that land and the Musalmans at large.

Now I want to say a few words more. In 1913 I went to Deoband for the first time in order to seek the help of the Ulema of that place for re-establishing Khuddam-i-Kaba. At the time there was peace in the country. The Ulema had kept themselves away from those movements which had the slightest tinge of politics and we were not receiving from them that assistance which we deserved. The fear of the Government was very great and no one had the courage to oppose them. That was the time for work when enemies were more and friends less. It was the time for walking in the way of God.

Dear friends, continued the President, can't you recall that time when our movement was started in the beginning of 1920? Then there was no understanding, not a pie in our coffers ; and no place for doing office-work. For the support to the Khilafat there were only a few men like Mian Mohammed Hajee, Jan Mohammed Chhotani and some of his friends. The mass of our people were aware of this but there was no special arrangement. Thanks to God that after Amritsar Conference, arrangements for pecuniary help had been made. The very first contribution that came to the Khilafat Fund was by an anonymous Zamindar of the Punjab whose name they would be astonished to hear. By the grace of God our movement grew stronger and stronger day by day till the Mohammedans of all the countries began to to take part in it. Moreover, two great Hindu leaders, Lokmanya Tilak and Gandhiji, who were respected by the whole country, promised to help the movement. After February Gandhiji began to take an active part so much so that he called himself a worker of the Khilafat. He used to tour round India in furtherance of Khilafat work and at last was arrested for writing an article on the Khilafat problem. I want to tell you that the Non-Co-operation movement which is now so successful and powerful, was embraced by the Mohammedans with full reliance upon God and with the advice of Mahatma Gandhi in

the Hindu-Muslim Conference of Allahabad. The Government was asked to consider our claims and accept them by the last of August. At Allahabad we had not much hope of the Hindus, but at three o'clock in the night of the holy month of Ramzan, we had resolved to sacrifice our everything for fulfilling that religious duty. And we determined that we would not take rest till the great God made us successful.

Khilafat Deputation

Our deputation was doing its work and stating our claims before the Ministers of England, Italy and France. The movement spread day by day, thanks to the efforts of the Mahatma and his friends, and you would be glad to hear that as the Congress had no Fund at the time, the Khilafat Fund contributed to the expenses of Madras, Gujarat and the United Provinces Congress Committees. Finally in September the Special Congress of Calcutta made the Khilafat problem a national problem. It was again approved at the Nagpur Congress. Thousands of Mohammedans and Hindus came out to work. We were under the impression that the Government would use their discretion and not make matters worse. On the other hand, the Government spent all their efforts to check the movement. The first attack was upon the Mohammedans which resulted in the famous case of Karachi. The coming of the Prince of Wales, the boycotting, the filling of the jails, and imprisonment of Desabandhu Das, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Pandit Jawahar Lal and Mahatma Gandhi were all known to the public. The work was spoiled in the absence of the workers. No worker remained. Weak-minded Mohammedans and Hindus came out in great numbers to destroy the soul-invigorating movement of liberty. No movement of the world and specially that of freedom and liberty was without its ups and downs. If they had victory to-day, tomorrow they would get defeat, but the courageous, patient and persevering nations always got victory in the long run. America fought for her freedom for six years. In the seventh year of that war, America had for her army neither clothes nor money. No one was willing to take the national notes. The soldiers were fly-

ing to their respective houses in distress. Even the Commander-in-Chief took a bribe of thirty-three thousand pounds from England and left the country in distress. In spite of all these, in the eighth year, small groups of brave men were formed and with great courage, patience, and perseverance began to fight the English. At the end of the eighth year they turned out the English from America. The pride of the Englishmen which found expression in the Tea Party of Boston vanished away. The English are up to this time repenting for it and admit their mistake. The British committed the same mistake in the case of Ireland and were repeating it on a large scale in the case of India. If that would not be rectified, the result would be similar *i.e.*, those who fight for truth and liberty always succeed. Let them remember the events of Karbala and see what the Abbsides had done. Now there was no trace of the Bani Umvades and their tombs. What happened in America, in the French Revolution, and in Ireland, and what was happening to-day in Egypt. If they were faithful and persevering in their efforts—which they were—they were bound to receive from God that help, which led to victory. They could now see the glimpses of it.

The Afghan Situation

In this connection, I want to tell the Government the views of Afghans regarding the Mohammedans. The Mohammedans of Afghanistan are our brethren. It is our desire that they pass their lives as a free, God-fearing nation. We remain happy in our house and they in theirs. Being our neighbours we are ready to help them in every way. They may do us service which they can. The former frontier policy has been proved barren. They are spoiled by giving them thousands of rupees as bribe. They are made greedy and avaracious and instead of helping them their morals are spoiled. But its last result is now known to all of us. Now the treatment of the Government with them is very cruel. For trifling things and lame excuses airships are sent there, their houses are bombarded, and their little children are killed. This brave nation bears all this and when they get

opportunity they kill an Englishman, a Hindu, a Mohammedan whosover happened to come before them and in this way they avenge themselves. Most often the Hindu and the Mohammedan soldiers are sent against them which breeds a sort of enmity with us.

In the Nagpur Khilafat Conference Mahatma Gandhi had moved a resolution which was seconded by me that His Majesty the Amir of Afghanistan should not make a treaty with that Government with which we have non-co-operation ; on the other hand, he should make a treaty with the Hindus and the Mohammedans of India so that we may pass our days in peace in one another's neighbourhood. We are not allowed to know the events of the Frontier and neither any Hindu or Mohammedan leader is allowed to go there. To-day the western sky appears dirty which cannot be cleared by the threatenings and the ultimatums. These things have been done thousands times and thousands of rupees have been wasted and the lives of thousands of the Hindus and Mohammedans are destroyed for nothing.

Now another method should be adopted. I am quite sure that if a commission would be appointed, if Mahatma Gandhi, Deshbandhu Das, Pandit Motilal, Lala Lajpat Rai, Maulana Abul Bari Sahib, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Dr. Ansari, and Mohammed Ali and such other leaders go there, they would settle the matter very nicely. I am quite sure that His Majesty Amir Amanullah Khan and his subjects would try to establish friendly relations with their neighbour. Even to-day every little child of Afghanistan knows the name of and respects the great leader of India, to meet Mahatma Gandhi. Would that the Government take advantage of this. We Mohammedans have explicit religious laws as well as the Fatwa of Ulema. We Mohammedans never care for life in the preservation of Islam and in the exception of its duties. I inform the Government in plain words that if they fight with our neighbour quite contrary to our wish, then they alone would be responsible for it. India would never help them in this tyranni-

cal act. England should spend her money if she is going to fight with Afghanistan.

Time for Work

The present was the time for work. God, His angels, and the prophets were looking at them. Their beloved Prophet, seeing the sacrilege of the holy places and their helpless but brave attitude, was praying that God might give us the victory—such victory as would preserve the prestige of Sultan Abdul Majid Khan—may God perpetuate his country and his greatness—and having united the whole Islamic world at one common centre of the Khilafat, Muslims might keep the holy places and the Religion safe and free from all impure and heretic influences.

Since he came out of the jail, he had been touring, inspecting very minutely the work of the Khilafat Committees. He found the bonds loosened but the links yet remained. He would tell the able workers of India that it was not the time for thinking, but in the world of the poet :

'To part with the beloved or to part with the heart,
'I am now thinking what to do.
'Stand up and make a brave dash for the last effort.
'How the intoxicated one is going towards the place of killing.
'Just see the attitude of the lover who has trifled with his life.'

He had every hope that in a few weeks the resolution and the schemes of the work which would be presented to them, would change the situation. An army of workers in the name of God would be formed. Hearing the voice of a weak, humble brother, the heart of every true Mohammedan would be affected and he would shout out :

**'Anyone should see whether it is the same wretched Dagh.
The bewailing of someone is making me restless'.**

Allowance to Workers

Proceeding, the President said, he considered it has duty to inform them of his ideas regarding a certain matter. Before his eyes three were many workers who had denied themselves all the pleasures of the life and had spent all that they had for the cause. Now they were in great distress and wanted to retire. These men having given their whole time to the Khilafat movement did not want to accept low reward wherewith they might support their famiy. They had given thousands of rupees but did not want to accept low reward wherewith they might support their family. They had given thousands of rupees but did not want to take any back. He was sorry to say that the very thing on account of which they wanted to retire and which they hesitated to take from the Khilafat fund was attributed to them by some by of the workers, the result of that was that those able workers were leaving the Khilafat movement. In the words of Ghalib :

'See, he is also saying that I am shameless and notorious.
Had I been aware of this I would not have given away the effects of my house.'

He would not approve of that attitude but would ask them to remedy that effect. It was quite true whenever any great movement was started many men of bad principles and weak ideas had joined it Sometimes loss of money had also been incurred, but those inevitable things had to be faced, without stopping the work. Should they then close the shop of Islam simply because of some difficulties or of some mistakes which had been exaggerated by their enemies for the detriment of their work. Should they compel the true soldier of Islam to withdraw from the battlefield by annoying them. In his opinion the time had come when their leaders should come forward and set an example for others so that an army of soldiers might spring up.

He hoped they would excuse him if he said with pride that from the very first day to the time of his going to jail he had

not spent more than rupees two thousand five hundred, which he could gather in one day's tour or in a few minutes in Bombay without any effort. He hoped that the conference would think over it and would make some suitable arrangement for the maintenance of workers in distress. Then the President paid a tribute to Maulana Hasrat Mohani and said that whenever he saw the condition of Khilafat Committees, his memory came crowding upon him. He was the bravest among us and ten years ahead of us. To-day he was happy in Yeravada Jail and might be saying to himself ;

'They are killing me for the crime of your love and so there is a great noise.'

'You should also come to your roof to see this pleasant sight.'

The torture to which the Government had put Hasrat Mohani and his other friends could produce no effect upon them. His poetry was a lesson for them :

'How can we create a taste like ours in others.
'We are more tired of the disinterestedness of our companions.
'Our goal is not very far away.
'But not when we left behind our caravan.'

And foı them he says :

'The highest degree of despair is also the beginning of love.
'We came again to the place whence we started.'

The Central Khilafat Committee should take in its hand the management of all those Committees which had become weak and supply the workers where needed. Some of his friends had given word to take an active part in the movement. May God crown their efforts with success.

Khilafat Deputation

As regards the Khilafat, they had asked the Government for passports for the Deputations which they were sending to Constantinople, Angora, Hedjaz, Mesopotamia, Palestine,

Syria and other Islamic countries. The Government of India had enquired the names of members of the Deputations and the routes of their journey which should be sent shortly. They could arrive at a true knowledge of conditions regarding the Khalifa only when the Deputations returned. He did not want to attack the personality of His Highness the Agha Khan or Mr. Syed Amir Ali. Those two men had great love for Islam and were serving it in their own ways. Service to Islam was not reserved for any sect. Nevertheless they should keep in mind that one thing which His Highness had told Syed Wazir Hussain, late Secretary of the Muslim League, and Mohammed Ali. Its purport was : "I cannot serve the religion, the country, and the nation so much as you, or your brother, or Mr. Gokhale is doing. These men have no other work save this. You should expect only so much help from me as the Englishmen give to their country".

That was His Highness' frank statement. Taking it into consideration he would tell His Highness that he being far away from India and not knowing thoroughly the feelings of Indian Muslims it was not proper to give opinion on any intricate problem, even though that opinion might be a right opinion.

The Khilafat Deputation, in the capacity of the representatives of the whole of India, would wait upon Khilafat-ul-Muslamin, servant of Harmain Sharifain—may God perpetuate his Kingdom and increase his prestige—and also upon Saiful Islam Ghazi Mustafa Kamal Pasha, as well as upon the brave Turks whose courage, perseverance, bravery, and ability saved Islam from a great danger.

I have every hope that one day we would be able to strengthen the Turkish Empire, the holy places and Islam and so I request you to make haste in this matter. Follow your own way in India with patience and courage and form an opinion only when you have the true knowledge of the affairs.

Fortunately, at this time, God has created some notable personages in the Islamic world. Among these names of the Khalifat-ul-Musalmin, Servant of the Harmain, Sharifain Sultan Abdul Majid Khan, Ghazi Mustafa Kamal Pasha, and His Majesty Amanullah Khan are very remarkable. From the words which the Khalifat-ul-Masalmin has uttered it follows that even in this hard time, God has created a man in the Usmania family who would not only face all these obstacles, but also would surmount them and thereby not only save the prestige of the Khilafat but also enhance it.

God willing, our deputations would wait upon Aziz of Hedjaz, Sharif of Mecca, and Amir Faisal and would make some satisfactory settlement with them. I, as the representative of the whole of India, say that the love which the Mohammedans of the world have for the Arabs and Arabia cannot be cherished for any other nation of the world. The land where God has built His House, the land where our beloved Prophet began his mission, the holy land where his sacred body is interred must be naturally loved by the Mohammedans. Our love for the Turks is due to the fact that when the Arabs and other races became weak they erected an iron wall of their blood and flesh between Islam and infidelity and checked the fast approaching waves of the shoals of infidelity with the wall of their breasts and saved the religion. Still our love for the Turks is far less than that for the Arabs. We now assure our Arab brothers that we cannot see them in the position of slaves even for a moment. The holy places, Jazirat-ul-Arab, and the Hedjaz are not their property but of all the Mohammedans of the world. We assure the Arabs that once the defects and groundless rumours are removed we would render them such a good service that the ray of Islam coming out of its fountain-head of guidance would illuminate the whole world. We hear that our Arab brothers are quite ignorant of religion and the wordly affairs, and that their moral condition is hopelessly bad. Quarrelling is a common thing among them. They have become greedy of money, power, good clothes, and luscious food. Hearing all this we cannot

but weep for them that the race which had taught to the world the lesson of self-sacrifice, has now so much degenerated.

We hope that our Arab brothers would not misinterpret our efforts for the establishment of the peace; but, on the other hand, making full use of the self-sacrifice of Siddiq, courage and magnanimity of Faruq, contentment of Usman, and self-satisfiedness and valour of Haider would try to make our efforts successful. They should also not remain behind any Mohammedan race of the world in the preservation of the prestige of the Khilafat and in assisting the Khilafat-ul-Rasool. May God crown our efforts with success so that we may see again the whole world illuminated with the ray of Islam.

Hindu-Muslim Unity

I consider it my duty to give you my views about the Hindu-Muslim unity. To-day we see that efforts are being made to disunite them, to destroy the Indian atmosphere in which we catch the glimpses of *Swaraj* and liberty. No doubt those men are first class fools who for the prejudice of the few blame all and give this trifling thing undue importance. It is quite true that the untimely movement of *Shuddhi* and *Sangathan* has created such doubts and difficulties as may break the bonds of union between the Hindus and the Mohammedans. The enemies of the country and liberty took advantage of this and fanned this fire to such an extent that the weak-minded people of both the communities aggravated the malady still more. There was also another cause, *viz.* that even the Khilafat and the Congress workers began to fight and quarrel on trivial matters. The selfish entities in order to reclaim their past honour came out by the instigation of the Anglo-Indian papers and tried to smother the genuine movement. Many Hindu and Mohammedan candidates for the membership of the Council began to sing songs of the social services they had rendered in order to defeat their rivals. All these things have besmirched the Indian political atmosphere. But, thank God, we now perceive signs of the victory of truth and their tactics do not seem to be successful.

Even in this difficult time, our Mohammedan community is comparatively courageous. It is why I have a complaint to make against the Mahammedans—why they have lost their temper at the untimely movement of *Shuddhi*. Our Arya brothers are defending their religion for a long time, and the *Shuddhi* is also going on. It is the duty of every man to preserve and preach his faith and religion. Our complaint is that it was not the proper time for giving momentum to this movement. It is the time for uniting together in order to face our common enemy with full force and put off our private affairs for settling at some other time. Nevertheless, even if it happened, the Mohammedans should not make so much noise and agitation. The Jamiatul Ulema which comprises Ulema of every school of thought is existing. They would have called a meeting and would have sent a sufficient number of workers to check all this. It is quite true that just like other Anjumans it has also become weak. However, it was not becoming of the Mohammedans to quarrel in the way they have done.

Preaching of Islam is the duty of every Mohammedan. It is our ardent desire to roam in jungles, barren places, and deserts of the world and among the savages whose hearts we may illuminate with the light of Islam. But this would be done when we are not confronted with anxiety and care. I shall very politely ask all the preaching Jamiats that they should not continue with this noble work their individual aims and, having removed all the differences of opinion, they should prepare such a scheme that the work may be carried on nicely. They should also not make use of vituperation while discussing any religious question with the non-Mohammedans. Some of our brothers are so much terrified with this *Shuddhi* that they even go so far as to advise the giving up of the work of the Khilafat which is all the more important. I have neither fear nor anxiety about this Shuddhi movement that I should ask the Mohammedans to leave the sacred movement of the Khilafat and the

holy places. Thank God, we have sufficient number of workers and contributors. All these movements may be carried on simultaneously and the aim of all is the truth. The giving up of this movement will prove our cowardice, fickle-mindedness and stupidity. Our enemies would laugh at us. We should give proof of valour, patience and perseverance, and should remain calm and quiet even in the face of the greatest obstacle. We should again gather together and each worker should search out his field of action where he should work without censuring his other co-workers.

Need of Patience and Self-Sacrifice

I still advise you to spend all your power in the formation of a group of Mohammedans. We should strengthen our position to such an extent that we may be able to face and surmount the greatest obstacle with patience. I always ask my Mohammedan brothers to set up an example of patience, courage, and self-sacrifice. Had Mahatmaji been out of the jail, he would have taught the lesson of magnanimity to the Hindus. All that I see to-day would never have come into existence. All this is due to our being the slaves of a foreign nation. Mahatma Gandhi had taken a leading part in establishing a remarkable union between the Hindus and the Mohammedans and all these unpleasant events which have happened in the country are due to his absence. Many selfish men came out and tried to wipe off the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi and to regain their lost honour. I fervently hope that the clouds of dirt and dust would be dissipated when the Sun of Truth and Courage will shine brightly. Mahatma Gandhi has repeatedly told you that the Hindu-Muslim unity is very essential for the freedom of India. In this connection, he never used ambiguous and equivocal words. I think it very necessary to tell you about certain events which may give you an insight into the ideas of Mahatma Gandhi. We all put up at a Bungalow of a Hindu Gujarati brother at Calicut in Malabar. There his family was also residing. In the night we delivered lectures before a huge crowd, which were translated to them in the Malabari

language. After the meeting was over I was to go to my waiting place. Mahatma Gandhi asked me to wait. I went with him into a very big house where our Gujarati brothers and sisters were present—and I was the only Mohammedan among them. The Gujarati Hindus entertained us with great hospitality wherever we went. I have heard many lectures and speeches of Mahatma Gandhi but the one made by him that might produce a peculiar effect upon my heart. It was perhaps the answer to the objection made by the Hindu Press. He said : "Many Hindus say, 'What has become of Gandhi : he not only takes part in their (Mohammedans') religious work, becomes their guest, but also takes the Mohammedans with him and waits in the houses of the Hindus ? Is he not aware that the Mohammedans pull down the temples and kill the cows ? Hence it is really a folly to give place to the Mohammedans in the house of the Hindus." Mahatmaji then said in a painful tone : "Yes, I like to go to their houses and wait there and I take the Mohammedans with me and wait in the houses of other Hindus. It may be possible that in the days gone-by the Hindu women might have been disgraced and the temples were destroyed by the Mohammedans. I assure the people of this type that Gandhi has not turned mad. Gandhi is a true Hindu. To-day he makes friendship with the Mohammedans and thereby protects his religion. Mohammedans are brave people, ready to sacrifice their life and wealth for the sake of religion. As compared with them the Hindus are weak. By living amidst them the Hindus to help them in their pure religious work is a social service. If the Mohammedans would succeed in having a satisfactory solution of the Khilafat problem, they would never forget the services we have rendered to them. They would have a great regard for us. The danger which the Hindus are anticipating from the Mohammedans would be averted by this help. The Hindus would no more be dishonoured, the temples would not be pulled down, and the cow-slaughter would be stopped for ever. The Mohammedans respect the Hindu women like their own. There is no deceit or trick in it. Sincere love will bring forth true reward. The two communities will live together in peace and comfort."

The speech of Mahatmaji impressed all Hindu brethren and sisters. The effect it produced in my mind was very great. In my speech I said to my Hindu brethren that Mahatmaji had shown them his sincere heart and that it would be my duty to relate this event, word by word, to every Mohammedan gathering. I shall ask them that as brave and God-fearing people they should render double service in return for this one, and that they should never forget the brave Hindus, who as our comrades jointly faced the tyrannies and torture of the Government, gave their lives, filled the jails, and who even in spite of the recent unpleasant occurrences are ready to follow the order of their brave Mahatma.

Hindu Sacrifice for Mohammedan Cause

Now-a-days the sulphurous gases to the "German War" are blowing in the air, and a propaganda of envy and malignance is carried on, day and night. We see every day the fights between weak Hindus and the Mohammedans. It is my duty to inform the Mohammedans of the ardent desires of their true companion, sympathiser and co-worker. Mohammedans are not ungrateful, and are not cowards. To-day the intrigues have succeeded in setting the Hindus against the Mohammedans ; but we are not likely to forget these brilliant services the Hindus have rendered to us. I have before my mind's eyes the faces of thousands of the Hindu men and women, which can never go out of my mind. It would be our moral weakness if we did not thank them for their services. A very short event will serve here as a good example. In 1921, I had to take the advise of Mahatmaji regarding a certain moot point. I went to his waiting place, but he was in the bazar, busy in the collection of funds for the Gujarat Vidhyapith I began a search for him and when I reached the Juhani Bazar through the cloth market I saw there a huge crowd of men who noticing my Khilafat car began to shout and gave me way. At last I reached near Mahatmaji with great difficulty. He was sitting in the shop of a Hindu brother who gave him for national education a cheque for Rs. 1501 and put

a garland round Mahatma's neck. Having seen me, that Hindu brother became very happy, threw a garland of flowers round my neck and gave a cheque for Rs. 1501 for the Khilafat. I said to him that I had not come for the collection of funds; but he said that he would contribute for the Khilafat also. The same thing happened in the second and the third shop *i.e.*, the amount which was given to Mahatmaji was also given to me. We got each seven hundred rupees from the second shop and Rs. 151 from the third. Besides I got for the Khilafat Fund three thousand rupees more. Hence while we have the petty complaints against the Hindus we should not forget such encouraging events. It is within my knowledge that the Mohammedans have also helped the Hindus in similar ways on different occasions. Both these communities should never let these events go into the limbs of oblivion. On account of the death of Lokamanya Tilak the 9th of August 1918 was a Hartal day. All shops and the mills of Bombay were closed. Hundreds of groups of men were singing and going at Chopati near the sea. The heads of all these men were bare. A Pathan was also going with them with his cap on. Some workmen of the mill said to him in a harsh tone, "put off your cap, it is the day of mourning." He taid, "I am also mourning for Tilak Maharaj, but on these occasions we do not put off our caps." Whereupon one of the workmen hit him with a stick and he got a long, deep wound in his head. He began to laugh and smile. The policemen said to him : "Make a report in the Police station so that this man may be arrested." But he said, "He is my brother and to-day has turned mad. I will never make a report of him in your police station." The next day he came to me by the Khilafat motor, and showed me his wound and related the whole story. I took him in my motor of Mahatmaji and said to him with a smile. "See my Mohammedan has got victory over your Hindus," and related to him the whole story. Mahatmaji became very happy to see such a sincere regard and true self-sacrifice and began to say, "It is quite true that you Mohammedans have won."

Refrain from Undue Criticism

Both these communities of India should have to make hundreds of similar sacrifices and have to refrain from censure and undue criticism. At last we have no mention the good things along with the bad ones.

We have now before us many stupendous affairs to be settled. Unfortunately, we cannot settle them so long as we do not attain *Swaraj*, so long as the halter of slavery is round our necks. The Hindus and the Mohammedans fight for trivial things and thereby strengthen all the more the chains of slavery so that they may never get freedom from it. The most important of all these is the problem of cow-slaughter. We know well the feelings of the Hindus, but the truth is that we are quite helpless in fully solving the problem. When the revenue of the land will be in our hands, we would stop the cow-slaughter and increase the number of goats by spending one or two crores of rupees so that the goat flesh may become cheap and common. In this connection, I shall ask my Hindu brethren that just as they remained patient for a long time so also may they remain a little time more. God will make a better arrangement. It cannot be decided by disputes and fights.

For the information of my Mohammedan brethren I have to'd them about the speech of Mahatma Gandhi at Calicut. Now with your permission I want to tell my Hindu brethren for their information about my own speech at Randir. Mahatma Gandhi was with me and both of us had given speeches. The zealous youths of Randir had given us welcome in their cricket pavilion. The President of the meeting had lived with Mahatmaji in Africa. At the close of the meeting he said in a joke : "I know that Mahatma is a believer in God, and it is our wish that God may make him a perfect Mohammedan." I and several other Mohammedans did not like this. Mahatma remained quiet, but I stood up and expressed before them the sincere feelings of a true Mohammedan. I said to him : "The best thing among the

Mohammedans is to present the gift of Islam to our every non-Muslim guest. Islam is for every man but before we ask any non-Mohammedan to embrace Islam we should give proofs of our being true followers of Islam from the concrete instances of life. I now ask the President and all of you whether we Mohammedans have proved ourselves to be true followers of Islam to this Christian English Government, our Hindu brethren, or to the men of other religions. Have we not cut away the very root of Islam for the paltry gain ? Are there not thousands of Mohammedans who are proud of their service to the enemies of Islam and give proof of their meanness ? How many Mohammedans are there who have sacrificed everything for the Khilafat ? Before we invite any non-Muslim to embrace Islam, we should first of all make ourselves true Mohammedans and give proof of our religious fervour and strength of faith. And then thousands of men would embrace Islam without our giving any invitation to them."

A Story

I related a story which was told to me by a flatterer of the Government and the servant of the Political Department. He was sent to Japan as a Government spy in order to get the trace of Maulvi Barkat Ullah and his companions and to find out their activities. He went also to Count Okuma, a Japanese Minister who treated him very kindly and heard patiently all his words. This man was a fluent speaker. He said : "We the Mohammedans of India have an ardent desire that the whole of Japan would become Mohammedan." The Minister asked him : "What is the state of Islam of India ?" He replied, "The condition of the Indian Mohammedans is hopelessly bad. They have no education, follow no trade, their morals are depraved, and everything is defective and bad. May God do good to the British Government which has given us comfort, saved us from bloodshed and made every arrangement for our safety and comfort. She had prepared for us many means of progress and prosperity, *e.g.*, bridges, telegraphs, etc." When he asked

him about the Arabs he said : "They are almost savages. They have no education, no art and have all the defects of the world in them. They are very greedy persons and as compared with the Mohammedans of India they are no men at all." He then asked him about the state of the Turks and got this answer from him : "Their condition is hopelessly bad. They have no management. Bribery is rife, and the Turks are full of defects." When he began to speak against Persia and Afghanistan, he did not leave even a single rag on their body wherewith they may cover their naked bodies. After all this, he said, that it was his great wish that God would bring all these countries under the sway of the British rulers that the inhabitants of these countries might pass their lives in peace and happiness." Count Okuma heard all this very patiently. When his shameless story was over he said to him in an angry tone : "Are you not ashamed of asking me to embrace a religion which is full of germs of slavery ? No matter whether the Mohammedans are forty crores in number still, of whatever country they may be, whether of Arabia, Persia, Afghanistan or India, they are shameless and degraded. Though we are less in number, yet we have saved our freedom by fighting with those who are four times as powerful. Do you want me to give place in my country to such a religion, the teaching of which makes men slaves and nothing else ? All the nations of India, Persia, Afghanistan etc., cannot be weak and cowardly ; hence it appears that it is the religion which teaches slavery. It is also due to Islam that the whole country is in a bad condition. Please go away. I do not want to hear such nonsense."

An Infamy

It is merely to make the Islam infamous that we may now ask Mahatma Gandhi, Hindu brethren, and other communities to embrace it ; because we have deviated from the right path of the Islam and so are not presenting the truly beautiful picture of Islam before the world.

Dear friends : Do you know the aim of all this utterance of mine ? May god give us courage, perseverance and His help so that we may sacrifice our lives for religion and be reduced to nothingness, and thereby, having given the proof of self-sacrifice, we may attain a new life. May we become true Mohammedans, and then everything is easy. All the obstacles and difficulties would vanish.

Couplet :

'A thousand days of grief and difficulty we have passed,
'Once the fortune belt in our favour, we then have everything.'

We cannot attain our aim by chattering, boasting, and bragging. The world would not listen to us so long as we do not sacrifice ourselves for the attainment of our much-desired goal.

It is on account of the Great War and these calamities that our lives become pleasant, and that with all our sins we begin to love Islam. A new light has dawned upon our hearts. How true is it :

'In love the pleasures I got are known to me alone,
'I have also endured griefs which are known to me alone,
'My both eyes grew tired in the mosque and the temple,
'I have seen so many sights which I know alone.'

Dear friends : Do not lose courage. Our destination is very near. There is no loss in this business. Do not be tired of the present difficulties.

'Griefs and sorrows would decrease in two or four days,
'This time would also pass away in two or four days.'

I want to tell those Mohammedan brethren of mine who to please the enemies of Islam utter heart-wounding words, censure us and wish all the time for the destruction of this work, that they can do us no harm, and that this attitude of their towards us would make them notorious and simple. If they are unable to do anything, it would be much better for them to remain quiet. We are the mad intoxicated

persons of Islam and so do not care at all for your abuses and censures

Couplet :

'They are giving me lacs of abuses,
'The interest-takers are taking interest.'

Work with Courage

As to our brave experienced workers who are found in every part of India, I shall ask them to rely on God, and take the work of the Khilafat Committees in their hands. Begin the work with courage and every step you take must be a forward one. You will then see thousands of men responding to your calls.

Couplet :

'When the noise of resurrection would arise from your street,
'Even from now lacs of people are ready to hear it'.

I do not lose hope even for a moment. You may complain against the Central Khilafat Committee. You may find mistakes in our work. Your quarrelling with us and refusing to help us to-day do not make us hopeless. We shall ask you in this way ; for we take interest in obtaining in this way. I have every hope from God that in spite of the unpleasant events of one and a half or two years, success is near.

Couplet :

'The bewailing of the nightingale has produced its effect,
'Take the hand, for the fowler's foot loses ground.'

It is my belief that if you and I trusting in God, gather together and work for three or four months with our full force, our efforts would surely succeed this time, and victory would run with its own legs to us.

Couplet :

'They are coming under the pretext of a visit on I'd,
'The prayer of the night of disunion has shown this day.'

Now what should I say more ? I like a Katta of Akba and with that I am finishing my story :

'Thou may remain on your own way but condemn not the nature,

'Give liberty to the legs of the sight, enchain the self-conceit,

'Though thine work may remain limited and be for mine own aim,'

'Take memory as your companion. Don't shut the effective door of Nature on it,

'Rise inwardly, check bewailing, take work of the tongue from the sight,

'Put your heart in zeal, don't complain, show the effect, don't make any speech,

'Mix in the dust, and burn in the fire. When the brick is formed, the work would continue,

'Dont't lay the foundation and don't build on the element of these weak-hearted (people).'

LETTER TO THE SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

The undersigned is in receipt of the letter of the Deputy Secretary No. D, 83 dated 5th February, 1924, with regard to the issue of the passports to enable Khilafat delegations to visit certain Muslim States.

2. With reference to the first part of paragraph 1 of that letter the undersigned regrets that he is unable to appreciate the reasons assigned for previous consultation with the Governments of the various countries to be visited, and no other reason is 'obvious'. The Central Khilafat Committee has no reason to doubt that the Government concerned would be prepared to receive the delegations unless, of course, any outside influence is brought to bear upon some of them and a

prejudice against these delegations is hereby sought to be created.

3. As a matter of fact, however, the Turkish Government has already telegraphed that the Khilafat delegation would be most welcome; and *Al-Qibla*, the official organ of the Hedjaz Government, has also published that the Sharif Saheb of Mecca is equally prepared to welcome such a delegation. Other indications also exist which leave the Central Khilafat Committee in no doubt about the matter.

4. Even if the Central Khilafat Committee had any doubt about the reception of these delegations, it would be far from clear why the Government of India should want to elicit the view of the Governments in question with regard to a matter with which only Mussulmans are concerned. It is a religious obligation imposed on every Muslim to exert himself and make peace whenever some Muslims have fallen out amongst themselves; and the situation in Muslim countries which the Khilafat delegations under reference would seek to improve has recently been aggravated, as newspapers indicated, by a sanguinary conflict in which one of the sons of the Sharif Saheb of Mecca is stated to have been severely wounded by the forces of the Amir of Nejd. It is surprising indeed that it should occur to any non-Muslim that such peaceful efforts as the delegations are intended to make would be welcome to those who share the same religion and are bound to recognise the imperative character of a Muslim's duty to make peace between his brethren.

5. It has repeatedly been declared by the Government of India that it does not desire to interfere in the religious concerns of the Mussulmans. The undersigned has no doubt that the Mussulmans of India would look upon the intervention of Government in this matter as an undesirable interference in a purely religious matter, which is a domestic concern of the Mussulmans themselves, and that they would certainly regard such interference as contrary to the repeated declarations of Government.

6. The latter part of pasagraph 1 of the letter under reference appears even more strange, inasmuch as Government is not inclined to tolerate the absence from this country of people whose presence here it obviously tolerates in spite of their conviction and imprisonment for alleged offences against itself.

7. As things stand at present, it is entirely in the hands of Government to prevent any Muslim who wants to do his obvious duty by his co-religionists from going out of this country to do it. The attitude of Government in recent years had forced upon prominent Indian Mussulmans an attitude towards it which has culminated in the case of most of them in conviction and imprisonment for the offences which Government has seen fit to select and specify in the letter under reference. But these alleged offences concern only the Government of this country, and, even if they are not wholly irrelevant in the dealing of Indian Mussulmans with their brethren outside India, they do not certainly bring any discredit in the estimation of the Muslim world upon those who have been made to suffer imprisonment by the Government of India in consequence to them.

8. Moreover, it is universally understood that the object of issuing passports by a State is to enable those who apply for them to seek the protection of the representatives of that State in the countries to be visited in case of necessity. The Khilafat delegations would not need, and do not desire such protection, and passports have been applied for only because under existing rules no Indian can leave the shores of India without them. To refuse to issue passports in such a case seems to be a clear abuse of a system designed in the interests of those who apply for passports.

9. In conclusion, the undersigned trusts that the passports applied for will be issued without further delay. Several months have already elapsed, and any further delay would aggravate the situation which the delegation hopes to improve on their arrival in the countries concerned.

10. Kindly communicate your reply to the undersigned as usual to his Bombay address.

Yours faithfully,
Shaukat Ali
President Central Khilafat Committee

14 February, 1924

ON HIJRAT AND NON-COOPERATION

In appears from the comments in a large section of the public press that the opinion of the Central Khilafat Committee on the question of Hijrat is being sought. It is therefore necessary that I should express my opinion on this matter.

It is an admitted fact that twc movements cannot succeed simultaneously, and such a course is bound to mar the unity of thought and combined action which are essential for the achievement of our object. Moreover, it does not tend to bring about uniformity and united force in the community. It is therefore that the Central Khilafat Committee did not take this upon themselves. For the non-cooperation resolution was adopted by common consent at Allahabad, and as a result of this decision all Khilafat members and workers are duty bound to devote all their energy in making the programme thus adopted a complete success. But (God forbid) if this movement fails, it would become the duty of the Khilafat Committee to decide upon some other line of action, and if then the Ulema and public opinion agreed upon Hijrat the Khilafat Committee would exert as much for its success as they have done and propose to do for non-cooperation.

As a Mussulman and a servant of the Khilafat Committee, I personally appreciate the efforts of those gentlemen who are carrying on propaganda in favour of Hijrat, and I pray for their success. But so long as non-cooperation is not pushed to its logical conclusion I regret I am unable to join the Hijrat movement, and evidently the Khilafat Committee, too, cannot undertake the responsibility. The movement of non-cooperation

should not be understood as non-religious or as having no connection with Hijrat or Jehad. Nor should it be understood that it is merely the intention of political brains after the model of Western diplomacy, and as separate from Islamic institutions ; or that this purely religious question, Khilafat meetings have been adopted as a political weapon in defiance of all Islamic laws. But the fact is that non-cooperation is named *Tark-i-mawalat* in the language of *Shariat,* and it has been inculcated and taught clearly in the Divine Book. It has also been explained therein when and in regard to whom non-cooperation is to be resorted to. Non-cooperation is therefore a form of Jehad, and the enjoinments of non-cooperation have been given with the same clearness and force as those of Jehad. Thus says the 'Quran'.

"Allah does not forbid you respecting those who have not made war against you on account of (your) religion, and have not driven you forth from your homes, that you show them kindness and deal with them justly ; surely 'Allah loves the doers of justice.'

'Allah only forbids you respecting those who made war upon you on account of (your) religion, and drove you forth from your homes and backed up (others) in your expulsion, that you make friends with them and whoever makes friends with them, these are unjust.'

Again the 'Quran' says :

'O You who believe ! do not take My enemy and your enemy for friends ; would you offer them love ?" (Mohamed Ali's translation of the 'Quran').

There are several other texts bearing on this matter in which non-cooperation with the enemies of Islam has been strictly enjoined and those who do not cease co-operation have been described in the traditions thus : Whoever befriends the enemies of Islam is from among them.

Renunciation of titles, resignation of honorary offices and government posts are kinds of serverance of connections and

are therefore included in the scheme of non-cooperation. It is true that the stages of non-cooperation which we are about to inaugurate are the most insignificant factors of that scheme which has been enjoined upon us in the above mentioned texts And I fear we may have to stand charged with infirmity in Divine Presence.

Even under these circumstances if British Ministers and responsible officers of the Government fail to recognise our peaceful conduct and avoidance of violence, it should be a matter of great wonder that we should be pursuing most ineffective methods in the face of most drastic and extreme measures which are being taken in destroying Khilafat and dismembering Turkey. Nevertheless, it has been thought fit to give one more and the last opportunity to the British Cabinet, by adopting the first two stages of non-cooperation, to avoid the danger of being counted as enemies of Islam as described in the aforesaid texts and in regard to whom the Divine Book contains most stringent commandments.

It must be clearly borne in mind that we do not initiate the first two stage of non-cooperation because *Shariyat* orders these and no more, or that we are not capable of a more vigorous action, or that we are afraid of the extinction of our movement on account of difficulties that it might entail But as a matter of fact we want to conduct this as our religious and national movement on the principle of gradual progress. However, as soon as it is brought home to us that our efforts in this direction do not lead to the desired result, we would necessarily adopt a more effective method whether it be *Hijrat* or some other course. Further, these stages are only meant to afford time and opportunity for preparations for further stages of non-cooperation.

It is our prayer that our present policy may suffice to open the eyes of the British Government, at least for the safety of their own Empire if not for the sanctity of the pledges. Justice is the fundamental principle of every Government and devia-

tion from this path is bound to lead to destruction. I wish to make it clear to the public that were it possible to avert this grave danger to the good name and existence of Islam, we should not have adopted non-cooperation. But it must be remembered that although patience and forbearance are no strange qualities in us, it is impossible to forget the religious obligations.

It is hoped that all my co-religionists as well as my esteemed countrymen would exert their utmost to make non-cooperation a success. I further appeal to them to avoid every kind of difference and division and to support this movement with an undivided mind and singleness of purpose.

'It lies in God to grant us strength'.

—*The Quran.*

FROM KHILAFAT TO SWARAJ*

All the members of the Committee present agreed that it was essential that the people in power at Angora should be convinced of the necessity of maintaining the Turkish connection with the Khilafat, which should remain, as it was designed at the very outset, to be of a world-wide character, not confined to the national concerns of any group of Musalmans only, but responsible for the religious commonwealth of the entire Islamic world. The Working Committee should proceed to Turkey to counter with their Turkish brethren in order to remove such misunderstandings as may have interfered with a settlement of the Khilafat question which could be consistent alike with the exigencies of the Turkish National situation and with the Shariat of Islam.

---

*Statement of Maulana Shaukat Ali, President, Central Khilafat Committee, at an important meeting of the Working Committee of the All-India Khilafat Conference held at Bombay on May 10, 1924 to consider, among other things, the situation created by Angora's decision regarding the Khilafat and the future of the Khilafat organisation in India.

great task will be accomplished. The Working Committee had, therefore, to consider to what other work the attention and activities of the Khilafat organisations in India should be directed while efforts are being made in the manner indicated above to arrive at a settlement of the Khilafat question in consultation with the Turks.

Muslims in India

It was agreed that while we should continue to press for the freedom of the Jazirat-ul-Arab from every form of non-Muslim domination and control, work must now also be undertaken to ensure the free development and progress of the Muslim community in India itself. It was recalled that before the outbreak of War in Tripoli in the autumn of 1911 Indian Musalmans were only engaged in such communal work in India and were endeavouring, on the one hand, to provide educational facilities for their community, expanding the Aligarh College into a Muslim University and by means of work on other such enterprises, and were trying, on the other hand, to take their proper share in the public life of this country after having secured communal representation in the Legislative Councils under the Morley-Minto Scheme of Reforms. Attention was then fixed so to speak, only on the domestic affairs of Muslim community in India, but ever since 1911 a succession of events compelled Indian Musalmans to pay considerable attention also to the needs of their co-religionists abroad, and in course of time, it led to a daily increasing realisation that the disintegration of the Islamic world and the rapid decline in the temporal power of Islam constituted an imminent peril to their Faith.

To arrest these processes became therefore their foremost duty even if it entailed the neglect for the time being of other duties, and they responded to its call to the best of their limited capacity. The magnitude of their task came to be recognised more and more clearly as calamity succeeded calamity until at last they realised that nothing short of a reconstruction of the Islamic world and a complete reform of Muslim life in accord-

ance with the ideals of Islam in all its pristine purity was needed. Disintegration and decay were the logical consequences of the fact that for many centuries the Khilafat had not been functioning properly, and the Khilafat was the one institution required now to initiate, stimulate, encourage, and in a general way supervise the work of reconstruction and reform. It was therefore hoped that as soon as Turkey emerged from her troubles, a reform of the Khilafat itself would be undertaken as a preparatory step to the reform of the Islamic world. The decision of the Angora Assembly has however altered the situation so completely that a reform of the Khilafat is no longer immediately possible, and will have to be undertaken when a settlement of the connection of the Turkish Nation with the Khilafat is finally reached. In these circumstances, it was being increasingly felt that the task of reconstruction of Muslim society in India should no longer be delayed.

Out of evil cometh good, and a religious revival following on the trials and tribulations of Musalmans has already quickened the Muslim pulse. A far larger number of Musalmans is now devoting its attention to religious studies in a spirit of free enquiry combined with humility and reverence, and it is to be hoped that added impetus will now be given by the Khilafat organisation to this movement, so that the distance which still separates the ordinary people from the Ulema may soon be reduced in a manner befitting the followers of a Faith that has no priesthood and recognises no distinction between the laity and the clergy.

Bitter experience during our recent trials has shown that our educational ideas and ideals need to be greatly modified. While institutions like the Jamia-Millia Islamia are more than even needed for higher education, and specially as nurseries for our future public workers and teachers and masses, and their curricula have to be revised in the light of the experience recently gained at such great cost, a far wider diffusion of education among the masses is a crying necessity of the future. A war of extermination must be waged against the illiteracy in order to

make the poorest and the humblest Muslim as nearly self-dependent as possible in all matters including religion itself. Vast areas exist in India today with large Muslim populations appallingly ignorant even of the elements of the religion, whom neither secular teachers nor preachers of religion have in recent times tried to influence and improve. They must no longer be neglected by the educated members of the community.

No village or group of neighbouring small villages and no quarter of a town should be without its schools for elementary instruction lodged in the mosque of the locality, and religious and secular education must go hand in hand and must suit the needs and circumstances of all classes of people, particularly the peasants and the workmen. For those who are too old to be attracted to schools, the local Mosque should provide facilities for a wider diffusion of Islamic culture. The appointment of properly trained Imams who could be the teachers of Muslim children, the members of Muslim youths and the guides, philosophers and friends of the more elderly Musalmans of the locality, and the establishment of library and reading room attached to every mosque would make it the social and intellectual centre and the ideal Islamic club-house of the locality. The establishment and organisation of Muslim orphanages would not only save our orphans from falling into wrong hands and from becoming waifc and strays, but would also provide a chain of nurseries of Muslim Missionaries comparatively freer than others and more like the Ashabi Suffa who formed the standing army of the Missionaries of Islam in the days of the holy prophet. The Mopla orphans are the first charge on our resources, and a beginning must be made with them at once in order not only to save them from starvation but also to change the race of the entire region inhabited by our Mopla brethren and convert it into a flourishing land, the abode of cultured people as peaceful as they are brave and industrious.

Mendicancy must also be eradicated from the Muslim community, and this noxious parasitical growth which sucks away only too much of the life-giving sap drawn from the soil by the

productive members of society must be uprooted. Work must be provided for the able-bodied vagrants and refuse must be established for those who suffer from grave disabilities, such as blindness or loss of limbs. Charity must be organised : Baitul Mals must be established, and Zakat collected and regularly distributed to the deserving poor. Pious endowments must be saved for the real beneficiaries from trustees who have converted them into private property, and are guilty of committing perpetual frauds upon the public.

The use of intoxicants must be discontinued, and Muslim society, once more purged of the drink evil, must stand forth as the pioneer of prohibition. Purity of morals must be insisted upon for men no less than for women, and the curse of prostitution removed both in practice and theory. Last, but not least, poverty is itself a great evil and the mother of many other evils, and while organised charity can do a great deal to mitigate its evil consequences, a better economic organisation of the community alone can constitute an adequate and permanent reform. Musalmans, especially in Upper India, have too long depended upon service for their maintenance to the neglect of trade and industry, and even those who are not ashamed to eat practically the bread of beggary are none-the-less ashamed of keeping a shop and of only top numerous minor professions that have wrongly been considered not respectable enough for gentlemen and the sons of gentlemen though the companions of the Prophet themselves were not too proud to follow them. These and other such evils are no doubt very grave, and the formulation of the best of policies and programmes cannot eradicate them by itself, and many generations may pass away before appreciable success can be recorded, but unless the best minds of the community can take all these matters into consideration, and sitting, so to speak, in continuous conference frame policies and devise measures to deal with them even the least success is hopeless, and further decline is certain.

Relation with other Communities

Musalmans have also to be taught to take their proper share in public life and to accept readily and cheerfully their

portion of the sacrifices and burdens and responsibilities as members of a composite Nation struggling to be free. They have to be fully awakened to a sense of their duty to their Motherland, and if they have to safeguard their communal rights against apprehended encroachments of any of their fellow-citizens, they must not neglect to safeguard their National rights against the long-continued and too-long tolerated encroachments of their alien rulers. They must learn to face their rulers as a united Nation, and to face their Indian brethren as a united community.

They must be taught to shrink from no legitimate sacrifice demanded in the causes of National freedom and of National unity, and far from extorting for themselves special privileges at the expense of sister communities, they should be willing to surrender as much as they can, even of their own proper share of benefits according to the Nation. But this surrender should be made out of love, not out of fear. It must be made out of their strength, not out of their weakness, and it must be made with their eyes open rather than in ignorance or out of political gullibility. It is on these lines that our political ideas and ideals have to be revised and our political activities reorganised. Had the Khilafat been functioning properly, it would have initiated or at least stimulated and encouraged, and in a general way, supervised the work of reconstruction and reform in every department of our communal life except politics which, apart from the diversity of circumstances and distinctive features and peculiarities of different countries inhabited by Musalmans, is additionally influenced and conditioned in the case of the Musalmans of India by their subjection to alien rule. But even if the Khilafat had been functioning properly, the execution of policies and programmes in any case would have been the function of the Musalmans of this country itself.

Today, however, we must not only execute but also frame them, and our unaided judgment must do the best it can during the time, short or long, that it may take to reach a final settlement about the Khilafat and to establish it on a firm, demo-

cratic, and international basis. The ideas had been the subject of many of Muslim public workers' cogitations and of his discussions with many of his fellow-workers ever since the Treaty of Lausanne was signed, and we secured a little breathing time. The sensational news from Angora, however, forcibly attracted attention once more to Turkey, and the future of the Khilafat once more became the one absorbing topic for Indian Musalmans, though now in a sense different to that when its future causes anxiety on account of the hostile intentions of our non-Muslim enemies. Our anxiety is still very great, but thanks to our National slavery, when we cannot even leave the shores of India for other Muslim lands on a religious mission of peace and reconciliation, nothing can be done to relieve that anxiety beyond waiting on our alien rulers once more with a request for the issue of passports on such terms as they choose to dictate in their characteristic arrogance, and hoping that at least some of our prominent public workers who were denied the honour of being declared guilty of offences against the State for doing their duty by Islam and by India would be permitted to proceed to Turkey and to convert their Turkish brethren to their own views on the vexed question of the Khilafat. Other public workers who are subjected to an embargo and are not allowed to go abroad have now leisure enough to take up the thread of their work in India and to resume activities that were interrupted more than a decade ago.

The Khilafat Working Committee now took great consideration of the vital question whether the Khilafat organisation should continue to confine its scope to the safeguarding of the temporal power of Islam, and in particular, to the restoration to Islam of the Jazirat-ul-Arab after freeing it from non-Muslim domination and control, and to the attainment of *Swaraj* in India as the best possible means to this end, or to extend it to the entire communal life in India as well. The Working Committee unanimously agreed to extend the scope of the Khilafat organisation and to make all communal work its province, in the first place, because a wastage of energy must be prevented,

and all avoidable friction must be avoided, and in the next place, because the community trusts the Khilafat organisation in spite of an insidious hostile propaganda of the most virulent and nefarious character, as it has trusted no other communal organisation before. Much of the dissatisfaction felt and expressed latterly with the Khilafat organisation, and particularly in Upper India, is by far the best and the sincerest complainant that could have been paid to it, for whatever the Musalmans have suffered or have felt aggrieved, they have petulantly asked why the Khilafat organisation has not come to their rescue, forgetting, of course, that its scope was limited. They had learnt to trust the Khilafat organisation, and that trust continues to this day. But the compliment implied in these repeated complaints is not in reality paid to individuals. It is paid rather to the democratic constitution of the Khilafat organisation. Leaving out of consideration for the moment our Indian brethren of other faiths who have done so much useful work as members and even office-bearers, the Khilafat organisation is open to every Musalman who chooses to pay four annas a year to its funds, and its creed is no other than the creed of Islam. It sets up no other creed. There is no class of the community which is not represented on it, except those, of course, who are too indifferent to the call of Islam or too afraid of their alien rulers to respond to it, and hardly any Muslim enjoying the confidence of his co-religionists is to be found outside its ranks. With a constitution so broad-based and democratic, the Khilafat organisation is well qualified to accept the additional responsibilities which it is the clear desire of the community that it should undertake. But the decision of the Working Committee is only the first necessary step in this direction.

The Future

The Central Khilafat Committee will meet at Delhi in the last week of June, and the Jamiatul Ulema is also invited to hold a joint session along with the Khilafat Committee. The whole question will then be thrashed out and finally decided and when work is undertaken in all these directions, and on

this large scale, a new chapter will, it is confidently trusted, be opened in the history of Islam in India. Our enemies have never spared us, and repression has followed ridicule, and ridicule has followed repression in a vicious circle. Their attacks have increased in venom and in violence, and the least that the community must expect from them is virulent abuse of the principal workers' assiduous efforts to sow further distrust and doubt in the minds of the masses. But the workers have already passed through this ordeal successfully, and nothing can wean off the masses from them except their own incapacity and their own betrayal of public confidence. On the eve of this great voyage, I wish all my fellow voyagers "God-speed," and hope that, as ever, they will place trust in God and in their own valiant selves.

LETTER TO THE DEPUTY SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT

BOMBAY
22nd May, 1924

In continuation of the correspondence regarding the granting of passports to the Khilafat deputations, the undersigned has been ordered by the Working Committee of the Central Khilafat Committee to inform you that while strongly resenting the restrictions imposed by the Government in the choice of the personnel it has decided, owing to the urgency of the work for the present to send only one of the deputations, *i.e.* to Turkey.

The Central Khilafat Committee had already through the undersigned assured the Government that the deputations had no intentions to interfere in the internal affairs of the countries visiting, but as the Government insisted on the petty annoyance of asking the individual members also to give personal undertaking, the Committee has required members of the delegation chosen to give undertaking if the Government was still of the same opinion and insisted on it.

The undersigned requests you to kindly issue passports for the following gentlemen :—

1. Dr. Mukhtar Ahmad Ansari of Delhi.
2. Hakim Mohammed Ajmal Khan Saheb of Delhi.
3. Maulvi Mufti Kifayatullah Saheb, President, Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Hind, Delhi.
4. Mr. Mohammed Marmaduke Picktall, Editor of the *Bombay Chronicle*, Bombay.
5. Maulana Sulaiman Nadvi of Shibli Academy, Azamgarh.
6. Mr. Tassadduq Ahmad Khan Sherwani of Aligarh.
7. Chaudhri Khaliquzzaman, Chairman, Municipal Board, Lucknow.

To avoid delay every such person was excluded from the delegation who came under the category of those objected to by the Government.

The delegation desires to leave as early as possible and would go via Suez and Egypt to Constantinople, Angora, and other parts of Turkey. The delegation would meet the President and the Members of the Grand National Assembly of Angora, the Ulema and other prominent persons in Turkey and to impress on them the desirability both in the interest of Islam and Turkey to reconsider their decision about the Khilafat.

The Mussalmans of India love their Muslim brethren all over the world and especially those of Turkey and Arabia, and they would be the last to do anything to bring discord and trouble to them.

The undersigned will be glad to supply any further information needed by the Government.

A very early grant of passports is requested.

Yours faithfully,
SHAUKAT ALI
President Central
Khilafat Committee

COMMUNAL PROBLEM AND CONGRESS WRONGS

I*

National questions cannot be settled through partisan newspaper propaganda. Certainly propaganda in modern times can do a great deal but a real and just settlement is out of the question by such process. Take the Versailles and Severes treaties after the great war and their consequence. These had to be scrapped and after a great deal of trouble the right solution was reached. Older history can give us a striking example. The Irish Union of 1801 was brought about by England using all kinds of pressure and persuasion: cajoling, bullying, bribery and corruption were made use of aud the Union was brought into existence constitutionally. But the result was that Ireland and England had to fight tooth and nail for over a century and eventually the Union had to be undone.

We in India should take lessons from this. The Congress and Mr. Gandhi should not force a Hindu settlement on Muslims which would not last long and it is for this reason we have been trying to make efforts for a fair and honourable understanding all-round.

Representation in a country's Parliament is the real thing and how that representation is made is a matter of much less importance. Let us face facts. We are in a worse position in India today than we were three years ago when the Congress in Madras adopted a resolution that satisfied both the Muslims and the Hindus. The country liked it also. But Mr. Gandhi and late Pandit Motilal Nehru wanted to re-open the question in the face of clear opposition from the Congress Working Committee and their Muslim co-workers. Their objections were disregarded and through clever manoeuvering the Nehru Committee was brought into being with the result known to the country.

*Presidential address of Maulana Shaukat Ali at the second session of the All-Bengal Muslim Conference held at Calcutta on 15 May, 1931.

After two years of wearing and tearing propaganda it had to be drowned in the depth of Ravi. But then, instead of accepting the offer of the British people for the Round-Table Conference which had been repeatedly asked for, a still more forward and risky movement was started at this time too in the face of an overwhelming opposition from the Muslim community and also from many prominent Congress workers. No sectional movements, however, useful and carefully organized, could succeed in the present circumstances and after a year of wasted energy, when thousands went to jail we find the position no better and feeling among the people more bitter and uncompromising. After all this trouble the Congress and Mr. Gandhi have agreed to go to the Round-Table Conference but this time the condition is laid that the Hindu-Muslim question must be settled before taking part in the second session of the Conference.

Everyone talks about the Hindu-Muslim question but no serious effort is being made to solve that problem. It is not difficult to solve ; at least we Muslims think so. I regret to notice that a tremendous amount of breath is wasted in abusing communalism. Now what is communalism ? It means today the recognition of the fact that in a country like India there are different communities present and on the satisfactory consideration of their claims and requirements depends the real solution. Why should communities be abused when this fact is forced on the majority community that they require special consideration ? In fact if you go deep into their requirements you will find that their demands are not unreasonable. Take for example the Muslims. This fact is clear that for over 850 years they ruled in India and the foreign nation, who came here as pleaders and merchants, taking advantage of the disruption and disunity among the rulers of the country carved out an Empire for themselves. Association with a vigorous and living nation has however given new life to the people of India and they are forcing the hands of the foreign Government to share the administration of the country with them and are asking for

more and more. The world position today is such that Great Britain must part with a great deal of its power to keep itself alive and after repeated promises and evasions the British Parliament realizes today that they have to make a serious effort to change the method of administration. They invited Indians, Princes and people alike, to a Conference for free discussions. The Congress representing the vast Hindu majority and also having under its banner other communities was a most important party. It had made a pact three years ago with the Muslims and other minorities which, was a very satisfactory arrangement. Some prominent Congress leaders however broke that pact and we had to face a new situation.

The minorities do not trust the vast Hindu majority. The non-Brahmins and the unfortunate untouchables amongst the Hindus have very real grievances against the higher caste Hindus who have deprived them of all that was decent in their lives. The Muslims with their historical importance have also received new and fresh blood and have no desire to merge their individuality and their culture into that of the all absorbing higher caste Hindus who have been unfair even to their own people. Then there are Sikhs, Christians, Jews, Parsis, Englishmen and other smaller communities who are all clamouring for special recognition. Now the vast Hindu majority have got so much that if they muster courage and exercise a little imagination and foresight they can' satisfy all and win them over to their side.

The communities are not evenly distributed all over the country. In the North-Western Frontier Provinces, Baluchistan, the Punjab and Sind there is a fairly big patch where the Muslims are in majority scales as in Bengal. In the Southern and Central Provinces the Hindus have an overwhelming majority. The Muslims are perfectly willing to give to the Hindus where they can all that they want from the Hindus where they are in a majority. In the Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan Muslims are prepared to give weightage so that the minorities may take an interest in the administration of

those provinces. Similarly they want the same proportion of weightage in Bombay, Madras, the U.P., Bihar and C.P. where the smallest Hindu majority is 85 per cent.

II*

We can do nothing if we are not united and put all our united strength in the constructive programme we have before us. I consider this branch of work more important than anything else that we can do at this juncture.

Since I saw clearly the working of the minds of the Congress leaders in Bombay, I have hardly any hope left in them for cool thinking or any wise solution of our problems. I regret Dr. Ansari and other Muslim friends in the Congress are apparently in a mess from which they cannot get out. On the invitation of Mr. Gandhi I went to see him and at his request spoke before the Working Committee also. I was given to understand that he and the Congress Working Committee realized the importance and seriousness of the situation, and would meet our wishes in a courageous and generous spirit. But I found that they gave us a big piece of stone instead of a small loaf of bread that we had asked for and this piece of stone was an old friend very familiar to us, during the last three years. Our good old friend the Nehru Report which was supposed to have been buried deep in the Ravi at Lahore was brought into life again. The Congress can keep it. The Muslims have no need for it. Therefore, it is more than necessary for us to sink our petty differences, forgetting even the Round-Table Conference ; and devote all our energies in improving the internal condition of our Muslim brethren in all corners of India. In spite of what Muslim Congress friends and old co-workers say about their strengths in the country, those who work day and night with the Musalmans—as I do know very well that the number of their supporters, though very loud and vocal, is so small that they hardly come up to one or two per cent of the whole popu-

*A summarised version of the presidential address delivered at the U.P. Muslim Conference held at Allahabad on 8 August, 1931.

lation of Muslim India. Somebody rightly remarked that there were more shepherds than sheep in that group. I wish them luck with all their intelligence. They have been wandering in the wilderness for three years and I have no doubt that before long they would realise that they have been made a cat's paw by Mr. Gandhi and their Congress co-workers I have seen with my own eyes that even the best of them have no position in the Congress and even men of Dr. Ansari's position do not count much because he gave them many a time honest advice, for peace and goodwill ; but apparently the more useful and easily influenced opinion of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad carries more weight in the Congress Working Committee than the group headed by Dr. Ansari who still commands respect for his personal character, courage and honesty, though his views do not find many supporters amongst the Muslims in the country. There is not the least doubt that an overwhelming majority of Musalmans stand by the demands of the All-India Muslim Conference formulated at Delhi.

The last three years have unfortunately separated Hindus and Muslims a great deal and there is no doubt that the two big communities have no confidence in each other. The recent sad and tragic happenings in Benares, Mirzapur, Agra, Allahabad and specially at Cownpore have made these feelings still more bitter. I am emphasizing this fact for the simple reason that no one should close his eyes to the real condition of things. We must face facts and then try to find out a remedy that could cure and heal wounds.

I have tried my best as a Musalman and as an Indian who has some love for this country, and who has also made some sacrifice for it. Why cannot the majority community which boasts that it loves its motherland and wants to gain freedom share it with all those who live in it – why can it not satisfy the demands of the Muslims, depressed classes and other minorities who are anxious about their future ? Separate electorate is not such a wicked thing as they make out, nor is the joint electorate such a wonderful boon as would remove all our

difficulties. The question of electorate does not deserve so much importance as is being given to it today. Apparently Hindu majority wants to have a say in the election of the minorities. The minorities have no confidence in the majority, knowing that it had done nothing for its own kith and kin, the untouchables, for centuries, have no desire to increase the number of depressed people in the country. For this reason they want separate electorate for such time as would give them full opportunities to organize its internal position and also see clearly if there is an improvement in the generosity and goodwill of the Hindu majority. What harm would happen to Hindus if the Muslim and depressed class demand for separate electorate was accepted ? The Hindu majority (caste Hindus) would elect their own members. Nobody wants separate electorate for ever. It is in the hands of the majority community to show by its conduct that it wants to its utmost to win the confidence of the minorities. If they do that, they will be serving the motherland : otherwise useless self-praise and crowing of nationalism would not carry them very far. I do believe that the Muslim community, in spite of what has happened in the way of aggressive propaganda by the Congress and the Hindus and in spite of the communal riots, would be satisfied to make peace if their modest demands as formulated at Delhi by the All-India Muslim Conference were accepted. If the Congress agrees to give Muslims ten clear years for internal organization with separate electorates, then they would probably consent to bury separate electorate for good and accept joint electorates at first with the late Maulana Mohammad Ali's formula and when goodwill and peace prevailed, drop the conditions and accept undiluted and unconditional joint electorate. Today Muslims are quite justified in demanding separate electorates.

I have great personal sympathy with the 7 million of depressed classes and when their leuders came to see me both at Bombay and Madras, I willingly on behalf of Muslims offered them heart-felt sympathy and promised them any help that we could give them in their landable efforts for their uplift. The caste Hindus having not done their duty by them, today their

backward brothers have no faith in them. They also want separate electorates as they know by experience that they have no chance in an open contest against the better educated, the better organized and the more powerful caste Hindus. It is no use putting hands on one's heart and shouting at the top of voice that we are rationalists and want to give other communities a chance. An ounce of practice is better than a pound of theory. This refusal of the majority to concede to the wishes of the minorities goes to prove that they are selfish and want to keep all power in their own hands and desire to perpetuate their domination. Everyone talks of surrender and blank cheques printed on 'Swadeshi paper' and written by 'Swadeshi pen', but nobody really gives any such cheque and even when they do give any they are unsigned.

To our depressed class leaders I tell frankly that Muslims are much too busy in improving their own conditions and have no designs of converting them to Islam. We want to become better and God-fearing Muslims. Therefore we have no designs on other people's faith. Islam keeps an open board on which any outsider can come in and join them by accepting the oneness of God and the Prophetship of Muhammad (God's peace be on him).

We have no high or low caste : all are here equal in the eyes of God and he who obeys his Master best and serves mankind has the highest caste amongst us. Whenever any Hindu and Christian or Parsee or Jew feels the call of faith, Islam will receive them with open arms and give them equal status. But our Quran teaches that there is no compulsion in faith. Today we gladly accept to give our depressed class brothers all help in their political and social struggle. And they have also promised to give us : as much support as they take. I desire here to make the same offer to the caste Hindus and people of other faiths. Come and make an honourable peace and you will find Mohammedans honourable friends and companions. At the same time, we want to tell all that we would not accept any

subordinate position in the future constitution of India, nor would we tolerate any bullying or domination.

I, along with my brother, visited England for the first time last year. When we reached there in November and I sought opportunities of interviewing responsible Englishmen, I found that they were nervous about the success of the new constitution which they were going to draft. But after working with the princes and the commoners of India they realised that India was capable and we could be trusted. When we left England after the close of the first session of the Round-Table Conference in January, India then occupied a very high position in the estimation of the English people. The Gandhi-Irwin talk was a hopeful sign but what has happened since then I am afraid has hardened the public opinion in England against India, and Mr. Gandhi and the Congress alone are responsible for this change. However, you should not lose hope : England realizes that India has advanced a great deal and I am sure the different elements like Princes, Liberals, Muslims and other minorities would give solidarity to any arrangements that may be made between England and India and would guarantee peace and order and good government. England is in a mood to make peace, and it would be criminally wrong not to make every possible effort for honourable understanding and peace.

Mr. Gandhi and the Congress must realize that they are making a very great mistake in not accepting the terms which the Muslims and other minorities have put forth. We have made and are making every day honest efforts for an uaderstanding but so far have met with no success. If we do not put any united demands then British people would have to decide between us, and if they give less than what India deserves the fault would be partly theirs and partly of those who have stood against a reasonable and fair understanding. I would tell Gandhiji and his co-workers for the last time that neither his civil disobedience movement nor his boycotting of foreign cloth nor any of his work would succeed even for a week if the two

great communities and the minorities do not arrive at a fair and workable understanding which in my opinion could only come if India including the states, the majority and minority communities and British people are all satisfied and everybody gets a fair chance.

In conclusion, I would beg of Muslims to keep the door of honourable peace open. If our 13 points are accepted the final solution about the electorates can be easily solved with the help of the late Maulana Muhammad Ali's formula—after ten years of separate electorates—which period would give us time to make up our deficiencies. We would devote all over time and resources for preparing our people to work in a way that would make our country's future certain, peaceful and glorious.